THE Lutheran Quarterly

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

ume VI NOVEMBER, 1954 Number 4

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume VI NOVEMBER, 1954 Number 4

CONTENTS

BULTMANN'S THEOLOGY AND THE MESSAGE OF THE PREACHER, *Martin J. Heinecken* 283

GRUNDTVIG AND MYTHOLOGY ..... *Johannes Knudsen* 299

LOUIS KOSSUTH AND THE AMERICAN CHURCHES ..... *Andor M. Leffler* 310

NOTES AND STUDIES

Resistance to Authority and Luther ..... *Lowell C. Green* 338
The Genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke ..... *Uuras Saarnivaara* 348

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Hungary: Apocalyptic in Hungary ..... *John L. E. de Papp* 351
Germany: Church Congress in Germany ..... *E. Theodore Bachmann* 352

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Minear, *Christian Hope and the Second Coming* (John Reumann) 356
Moe, *The Apostle Paul: His Message and Doctrine* (E. E. Flack) 358
Miller, *Fire in Thy Mouth* (Harry F. Baughman) 359
Phillips, *The Gospels Translated into Modern English* (R. D. Snyder) 360
Scott, *The Crisis in the Life of Jesus* (William H. Cooper) 360
Millikin, *Jeremiah, Prophet of Disaster* (Robert H. Boyd) 362
Long, *Queen Esther, Star in Judea's Crown* (Robert H. Boyd) 362
Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (Harvey D. Hoover) 363
Niles, *Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection* (Amos John Traver) 363
Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America* (W. D. Allbeck) 364
Barth, *Against the Stream* (T. A. Kantonen) 367
Heim, *The Transformation of the Scientific World View* (S. L. Olsen) 368
The Socratic (Martin J. Heinecken) 369
Minear and Morimoto, *Kierkegaard and the Bible* (Martin J. Heinecken) 370
Spier, *Christianity and Existentialism* (Martin J. Heinecken) 370
Ladd, *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God* (Martin J. Heinecken) 371
Berkhof, *The Second Coming of Christ* (James J. Raun) 371
Gogarten, *Verhängnis und Hoffnung der Neuzeit* (Otto W. Heick) 371
Künneth, *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott* (Walter G. Tillmanns) 372
Schnucker, *How to Build the Rural Church Program* (C. C. Madsen) 373
Growing in Christ (Ralph D. Heim) 374
Twenty Occasional Sermons (Edmund A. Steimle) 375
Huggenvik, *Victory By The Cross* (Harry F. Baughman) 375
Taylor, *A Sober Faith* (John V. Halvorson) 376
New World Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures (John V. Halvorson) 376

CONTRIBUTORS

Martin J. Heinecken is professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary.

Johannes Knudsen, formerly professor of Church History in Grand View Theological Seminary, Des Moines, Iowa, is teaching during the current year in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

Andor M. Leffler is pastor of the First Hungarian Lutheran Church in Cleveland, Ohio, and has been editor for many years of Erös Vár, a Hungarian Lutheran church paper.

Lowell C. Green, a pastor of the American Lutheran Church, is completing studies at Erlangen University.

Uuras Saarnivaara, formerly a professor in Suomi Seminary, Hancock, Michigan, is occupying an editorial post in Finland.

Reporters on "Life and Thought in World Lutheranism" in this number are John L. E. de Papp, pastor of St. Peter's Lutheran Church in Greenport, Long Island, New York, and E. Theodore Bachmann, professor of Church History in the Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, California.

Among the reviewers in this issue are W. D. Allbeck, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School; Robert H. Boyd, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul; William H. Cooper, professor of the Old Testament in Northwestern Theological Seminary; E. E. Flack, dean of Hamma Divinity School; John V. Halvorson, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; Otto W. Heick, professor of Systematic Theology in Waterloo Theological Seminary; Martin J. Heinecken; Ralph D. Heim, professor of Christian Education in Gettysburg Seminary; Harvey D. Hoover, professor emeritus in Gettysburg Seminary; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School; C. C. Madsen, professor of Practical Theology in Trinity Theological Seminary; Stanley L. Olsen, professor of Philosophy in Augustana College, Sioux Falls; James J. Raun, professor of Systematic Theology in Northwestern Theological Seminary; John Reumann, instructor in the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; Russel D. Snyder, professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; Edmund A. Steimle, professor of Homiletics in the Philadelphia Seminary; Amos John Traver, professor of Practical Theology in Hamma Divinity School.

Bultmann's Theology and the Message of the Preacher

By Martin J. Heinecken

MY INTENTION is to try to make clear what effect the acceptance of Bultmann's views will have on the pulpit. How will it affect both *what* the preacher has to say and *the way in which* he says it?

Immediately there is a parting of the ways. There are those who are convinced that all Bultmann is pleading for is such a proclamation of the Gospel that it will cause men to face the decision—the real either-or of "faith" or "offense" instead of the alternative between "intellectual acceptance" and "doubt"—without any personal involvement. Only so can the Gospel really save men, i.e., free them from bondage and restore them to their true selves. In fact, it should be quite clear that if the whole New Testament, as Bultmann contends, is to be read as primarily *kerygma* and not as either biography or doctrine or moralizing, then the preacher of today will have his task cut out for him. The New Testament gives the basic and fundamental and authoritative pattern of how the Gospel was addressed to the situation in the first century. The preacher today has no other task than to proclaim that same Gospel to the situation today, taking into account what in the situation today is the same and what is different, and never confusing the *kerygma* itself with those elements in the situation which are caught up in the relativities of time and space.

So the defenders of Bultmann on the one hand: Demythologization releases the *kerygma,* the real message of the preacher, and makes it possible for men with intellectual honesty and scientific respectability to proclaim the Gospel and to touch men in their *real need* by making it clear that twenty centuries have not basically altered that need and the answer of the Gospel to it. Men are not freed from the powers that enslave them, from guilt, from insecurity, from tragedy, or (in the words of the Catechism) from sin, death, and the devil except by the act of God in Christ to which the Bible witnesses.

On the other hand, there are those who are convinced that if

Bultmann's theology is consistently followed, the preacher will really have nothing left to proclaim. Theology ends in anthropology; there is no decisive all-time-dividing, new-aeon-creating event. God might just as well disappear from the picture. All that matters is the way we understand ourselves and become reconciled to our situation and boldly face up to it. For this the encounter with Christ would be only the occasion, and the learner, as Kierkegaard says, would really owe the teacher nothing for having reminded him of what he knew all the time, but there would be no Teacher to whom the learner owed all and there would be no companion to take the weary and frightened pilgrim by the hand and walk with him through the valley of the shadow. All there would be would be the echo of one's own voice.

However false I myself consider this latter interpretation of Bultmann to be, there certainly is this initial difficulty, that there is as yet, and perhaps may never be, any real clarity about just exactly what Bultmann does mean and what the full implications of his position are. Yet this can and must be said. There is a point up to which by far the larger number of critics—in Europe at least—also stand where Bultmann stands. There is a vast common ground which marks the repudiation both of Biblicism, Fundamentalism, and Orthodoxy on the one hand and of Liberalism (Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Harnack, Troeltsch) on the other, such as still characterizes much, if not most, of American preaching today. It is only after a point that there comes the parting of the ways. We must see, therefore, that the battle-line is not at all drawn (where it is still for the most part drawn in this country) at the question of how higher criticism can be allowed and the Bible cease to be an authoritative textbook in geography, astronomy, and the natural sciences generally while still being authoritative in matters of ultimate concern. Most often there are only two alternatives. Either the Bible is regarded as ordinary history, and then it is caught in the relativities of time and space and can make no claim to absoluteness. The Jesus of history is the child of his time and cannot speak with authority in the twentieth century unless he is merely the bearer of timeless truths. This then is the other alternative: The Bible is authoritative as the bearer of timeless, universal truths, but then the historical events it records are no longer of crucial importance. There is a third possibility of regarding the Bible as neither an exact historical record in the ordinary sense nor as a bearer merely of universal truths. It is rather

the human record of God's self-impartation in which the part which "myth" (carefully defined) plays is recognized. On this there is common agreement. The parting of the ways comes at a point beyond this.

What I propose to do, therefore, is to set forth that about which I think there might be agreement and show what this will mean for the message of the preacher. Then I shall also try to show what will result if Bultmann or anyone else goes beyond this common core. Finally I shall try to illustrate the message of the preacher who shares that in the theology of Bultmann which, so far as I am concerned, is not under dispute.

I

Let me, then, first state what I consider of prime importance. The preacher's first task is that of getting people's attention. We must arouse the people of our generation to the situation in which they really are as human beings, to their real predicament—not because Communism happens to be threatening their cherished liberties or an H-bomb puts the achievements of civilization into jeopardy, for then, if this were all, when the danger passed, likewise would the concern. The Christian proclamation must first of all divest men of every false hope and every false security. They must, without first having gone throught the bitter experiences of disillusionment to which Europeans have been subjected, come to realize that it is only at the point of utter despair of self and of this world (i.e., "the flesh") that God is encountered. To that end I think Bultmann's theology is helpful when he insists that the difference between the old man and the new man in Christ consists precisely in this, that whereas the old man means to live by controlling his destiny by means of that which is disposable (*verfügbar*), (i.e., which he can master either by the intellect or the senses or some kind of direct manipulation), the new man in Christ lives by "faith" in the unseen God without any guarantees of any kind except that of the encounter with God himself. This is true "eschatological existence" and not standing on the street corner in your nightshirt waiting for the moon to turn into blood.

Bultmann considers this a radical application of the doctrine of justification by faith alone to the realm of epistemology. When I stand before the holy God as sinner I must depend altogether upon God's love and his willingness to accept me as I am, and every attempt at self-

justification is the sign that I have not yet learned what it means to stand *before God.* It is an attempt at somehow still retaining control and still disposing over my own destiny.

Just so it must be also with respect to God's approach to me in revelation. This can be in no way at my disposal. I can in no wise sit in judgment on it so as, from my own vantage point, to judge it true. Nor can I have any other guarantee that here God is speaking except that assurance which comes from the God himself who is speaking, and in his speaking is acting.

This means taking seriously the absolutely paradoxical character of the revelation, and this is, in fact, all I understand demythologization to mean—just this taking seriously the fact that the transcendent, unseen, and unseeable God, who, in this sense at least is "wholly other," *never did and never can appear to man directly* so that he can be apprehended with the senses. This would violate the terms of man's existence and would be prematurely turning faith to sight. When God appears, therefore, he is *always hidden* and is discerned only in faith. Revelation and faith are always corollary.

This is true whether one is thinking of what is not very happily called general revelation or of what is equally unhappily called special revelation. It is true whether one is speaking of God's presence and self-impartation in what Luther called the "masks" of creation or of his presence and self-impartation in Jesus Christ as the Word become flesh or of his presence today in Word and sacraments. Here one can only speak of what John Baillie calls a "mediated immediacy" or, to use Luther's phrase, of a presence "in, with, and under."

One must take seriously that the contemporaries of Jesus had no advantage whatsoever in getting into the decisive relation to him. There was nothing offered to them in the way of proof which authenticated the tremendous fact of God's gracious presence among men at a time and place. Nor is there anything offered to us after twenty centuries by way of proof which could make it easier for us to have "faith" and so be freed from our bondage to ourselves and the world. It is precisely the sign of our bondage that we continue to ask for such proofs and guarantees.

As Kierkegaard insisted, there is no difference between the disciple at first hand and the disciple at second hand, no matter how many generations removed, insofar as getting into the decisive relation to

Christ is concerned. Therefore, we must take seriously what it would mean if the day when God had chosen to become incarnate and walk among us in the form of a servant had been today, the time 1954, the place Podunk Falls, the servant-form a filling station attendant with nothing about him to betray a hidden glory. The incognito—as Kierkegaard put it, and I am sure that Bultmann would agree—must not be penetrable in any way.

It is this absoluteness of the paradox of the revelation, penetrable only with the eyes of faith, which is violated by what Bultmann calls the myth *unless the myth is properly interpreted.* In the myth, as Bultmann defines it, the other world (i.e., those mysterious powers upon which man knows himself dependent) appear as this-worldly (i.e., as directly discernible to the senses, and therefore offering some kind of guarantee of their presence and their actions). To observe them in action, all that is necessary is that one should oneself be physically present. Any element, therefore, which supposes that all you have to do is to open your eyes to behold God, like the "prodigious greenbird sitting on a fence-post cawing in a most unusual manner," or like the omnipresent policeman, of whom Kierkegaard speaks, who is always turning up when he is not wanted, will have to be—not eliminated—but interpreted.

It can hardly be denied that there are elements in the Bible which contradict the affirmation that God does not directly appear and make himself disposable by man. These are, as Bultmann asserts, part of the pre-scientific world picture, where there is easy commerce between the supernatural and the natural and God's interest in the chosen people is directly discernible, e.g., in a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. What could really be discerned only in faith, viz., that Moses' guidance is in fact the guidance of God and that God himself is vitally interested in liberating his people, is here objectified mythologically. The same is true when the passage through the Red Sea is described on the one hand as the result of God's causing a great wind to blow (which, of course, would effectually hide the hand of God) but on the other hand as much more directly discernible in the water's standing to the right hand and to the left. This account must therefore be interpreted, and we must see what it has to say to us: that the deliverance of God's people is the result not of their own devices but solely of the absolutely miraculous intervention of God.

This, however, is not mere allegory, for it speaks of actual historical events in which the salvatory event is discerned by faith.

Exactly the same would apply to the New Testament record. It is contended that we today cannot turn the clock back and therefore cannot but accept the scientific world view with respect to the observed uniformities of nature in a strict cause and effect sequence. Wherever, therefore, elements are introduced which we quite naturally regard as superstition, we must not set up a false stumbling-block. We must not, as Wilhelm Herrmann suggested long ago, make a virtue of believing what runs counter to evidence. This, too, is a form of work-righteousness, this wanting to have credit for believing three impossible things before breakfast, like the Red Queen in Alice in Wonderland. This is not the proper *sacrificium intellectus*. If people in the first century believed that diseases were caused by demons, and if Luther shared the beliefs of his day by peopling the world with demons and holding other superstitions, we must not mistake this for part of revelation.

Hence it is quite clear what the witness is with respect to the miracles of Jesus! What the historical Jesus actually did in the way of healing the sick, raising the dead, and in other ways "authenticating" himself as the Messiah we shall never be able to establish with other than a modicum of probability because we do not have any plain, simple historical records. But that he is the lord over life and death, for this we have the *certainty* of faith. That he attracted attention to himself cannot be denied, but that none of these miracles really "authenticated" him as the one who was to come as the saviour of the world no one should be so brash as to assert. For whatever he did, those who were "offended" by him found other explanations, as, e.g., when they claimed that he drove out the demons by the prince of the demons. There is great significance in the answer given to John the Baptist when he cried to Jesus from the prison of his doubts, "Art thou he that should come or must we wait for another?" Jesus in reply does indeed point to the things which could be seen and heard, but then he adds, "And blessed is he whosoever is not offended in me." This removes the whole encounter from the realm of doubt and acceptance in the sphere of probabilities and makes it a matter of personal encounter with him in whom alone there is salvation and true release from the guilt, insecurity, and tragedy of existence.

The eschatological character of those sign-events is clear. It is not a question as to whether or not one will now believe that a certain *man* did astounding things, for all people of all ages are willing enough to believe this, and we in our day have once more learned not to be so cocksure about what can and cannot happen. Nevertheless, all this would remain in the sphere of the relative where we, too, might gain control if only we knew enough. Here we are confronted with quite another matter, not the *improbable* merely, but the *impossible,* as far as any human power is concerned. It is complete victory over sin and disease and insecurity and tragedy. It is ultimate security and release from anxiety and guilt in the God who loves unconditionally. This is not at all a controllable, human possibility, but can only be received as a gift, "and blessed is he whosoever is not offended." We can grant what human possibilities we like. We have crashed the sound barrier, and some day, no doubt, space ships will cruise from planet to planet. We have the cobalt bomb, and some day, perhaps, cancer will be cured and eliminated as have some other diseases that plagued mankind. We have split the atom and released power immeasurable for good and for evil. So, I, for one, will not set any limits to what is and what is not humanly possible in the achievement of control in the world that is at man's disposal. Yet there is an absolute barrier, and to this the sign-events of the miracles point. With all our control we cannot end the insecurity, tragedy, and guilt in which we are enmeshed, and precisely our efforts to accomplish it constitutes our bondage to "the flesh." The one thing we must not do, therefore, is to drag the Christ down into this same sphere and think of him as one who possessed some kind of superior power over the flesh, a power which we can learn from him by paying careful attention or have infused into us from him in the form of sacramental grace so that we, too, shall be able to exercise this superior control and enhance the sphere of our mastery over this world. Here we are confronted by the absolute Lord, and the miracles point to his lordship. In him is the "impossible possibility" of God. With men it is impossible, absolutely impossible, and the camel going through the needle's eye is the startling symbol of it, but with God all things are possible. So every one of the miracles calls us away from our false self-dependence and our mad endeavors to control our destiny and summons us to a recognition of where our salvation lies. But surely this requires an inner transformation of our

whole existence, *and I see nothing of what is here revealed except in faith.*

All this can be expressed in another way. There is a difference between certain types of events, however they are designated. There is, on the one hand, the ordinary historical event which is part of the causal sequence in space and time. It is altogether immanental (*diesseitig*); it is measurable and, within limits, controllable. To it applies the method of the natural sciences. With respect to it there is never absolute certainty but only a degree of probability. This goes for past as well as future events. That George Washington lived has only a degree of probability, just as it is only probable and never certain that the sun will rise tomorrow. Every such historical event might have been otherwise and does not exhaust the possibilities. To such ordinary historical events belong the facts of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, of what parents he was born, where he worked, the things he did and said, how he died and where he was buried.

It is a matter of common agreement that the four Gospels do not purport to be that kind of biography of the man Jesus. This is indicated already by what is left out. They are rather the post-Pentecost witness of believers to what this historical person meant to them. This should help us to distinguish a different kind of event. It is the revelatory or salvatory event in which, quite paradoxically and in a hidden, non-discernible way as far as the senses or the insights of reason are concerned, the unseen God enters into space and time and effects man's redemption by imparting himself. Such salvatory events are inseparable from historical events. They are "hidden" in them. They are not along side of but "in, with, and under." There is no transubstantiation.

Let us apply this now to the two crucial events in the life of Jesus. For his contemporaries Jesus was quite obviously the son of Joseph and Mary, born ostensibly in Nazareth in the ordinary course of events. For faith, however, the story is different, and it is quite futile to establish what is so for faith as you would establish the biographical record. Here there is already a proclamation which calls for a decision of either "faith" or "offense," for what is here proclaimed is *no longer in the realm of probability so that it might be doubted or believed as more or less credible things are doubted or believed.* What is here proclaimed is an existential proposition. That is to say, it is a proposition which cannot be affirmed except as in one's whole being or existence

one participates in what is affirmed, unless, therefore, it makes a real difference in the life of the one who in "faith" affirms it or in "offense" sorrowfully or indignantly turns away. Here the wager of one's whole life is involved. Here revelation and faith are strict corollaries, for *nothing is revealed and nothing is apprehended except where there is either "faith" issuing in obedience or "offense" issuing in revolt, and both are equally God-worked.*

What is this event? For faith Jesus is born in Bethlehem in fulfillment of prophecy; his birth is announced beforehand by an angel, and at his birth the heavens themselves are opened and a whole multitude of the heavenly host proclaim what has happened to the glory of God and the salvation of men. Yes, and a star makes it known even far beyond the reaches of little Palestine; a star moves across the sky like a lantern held by an invisible hand, and it guides both the wise and the powerful to a babe in a manger. This is what *faith* sees—this and more: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." "Behold, this child is set for the rise and fall of many in Israel." Here is "Immanuel," God-with-us. Yet that night was still like every other night, and the stars moved in their courses with the same regularity. *None left its appointed place,* and even if there was an unusual constellation, this did not in a miraculous way betray or "authenticate" that all of history here culminated in the fullness of time. Calling the Bethlehem star a constellation is in itself already a sort of demythologization.

And faith sees still more: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." Here is not an ordinary birth, though it is certainly just as ordinary as it can be, and no one makes this fleshliness of the incarnate One clearer than the writer of the fourth Gospel. As Cullman points out, in almost every event there is ambiguity between the genuinely earthly, historical, fleshly and that which faith in it discerns: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto myself."

Furthermore, for faith there is a witness to the virgin birth, and we certainly ought once and for all to be able to get into the clear concerning this still so much flaunted shibboleth of orthodoxy. Suppose it be granted for the sake of the argument that what is at stake is that *a man* should be virgin-born. That is and remains in the realm of probability and would, if it occurred, be, at most, unusual and astounding. Here we can see the changing fortunes of what comes

under scientific scrutiny. What a few decades ago would by the most competent men of science have been conclusively ruled out as utterly impossible would not now be so categorically dismissed. Since there is parthenogenesis among insects it would have to be allowed as at least a possibility that a man, too, should be virgin-born.

But is this really what faith affirms? It affirms that a genuine, human being is born, no doubt about that. The genealogy is purposely traced to the progenitor of the race. What is different here, however, completely eludes any kind of scientific scrutiny and is open only to the eyes of faith, viz., that this one is from above and not below, that in him God himself is present and acting. He is, for faith, nothing less than very God of very God, of the same and not just like substance with the Father, as faith expressed it at a later time when the line of battle had shifted and others were attacking the absolute uniqueness of this event. Now, where is the man who by careful methods of research, by blood tests or vaginal examinations, can establish that this is so, as he might readily enough if all that were at stake were the virgin birth or even the authenticity of a shroud of Turin?

So here we have, at the beginning of the life of the man Jesus, an event of a different order, an event which surely happened, as faith affirms, and which makes of the story of this man Jesus something quite other than the biography of a good man, though indeed he was that too—in fact, for faith the only good one, even though his contemporaries called him a glutton and a wine-bibber.

Turning now to the end of this man's life, what do we have? Again we have one investigable historical event, a death on the cross, which anyone who had walked to Calvary that day might have witnessed. But for whom was there a darkness over all the earth, and for whom was the veil of the temple rent in twain? For whom was the dying man's cry on the cross the cry of victory and not defeat? Surely not for anyone who stood that day on Calvary, including the mother who bore him and all those who had once been his avid disciples. Or shall we at this point wax sentimental and see Mary through her tears envisioning how some day out of this defeat of goodness there would arise a vindication as men at last recognized him whom they had pierced, perhaps in this highly enlightened twentieth century which had written so many appreciative biographies of "the Nazarene?"

No, except for faith it remains a tragedy, and every corroborating miracle which purports to prove it otherwise to all and sundry, even the unbeliever, must be ruled out. This will be true then also of the resurrection, for this is not an event which anyone who that day happened to stroll into Joseph's garden might have witnessed. Here it is clear that we are again confronted with an event which, just like the death for the sins of the world, precludes any direct apprehension. The witnesses to this event are none other than the chosen witnesses whom the risen Lord himself persuaded of his presence. For all others this claim of a risen Lord is *either* the cause for offense, provided they really are confronted by the claim that the Jesus whom they had crucified had been raised up by God and made to be both Christ and Lord and by the demand that they now repent and be baptized in his name, *or else* it is really a matter of indifference and all that is involved are the claims of a relatively few that a dead man had returned to life, for which as good an explanation as any would be that the disciples came and took away his body. That an isolated individual had come back to life it was possible even for some of the so-called believers to affirm—as is evident from the situation in Corinth—without their really affirming that which for faith alone matters. St. Paul makes this clear by his curious reversal in I Cor. 15: "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not raised." In other words, if there is no really sovereign Lord, who can bring life out of death, then the man Jesus would not have been raised either. This, then, is what faith affirms, not the astonishing return of a man from the grave so as now to be seen by every Tom, Dick, and Harry who happened to look that way, but the absolute and final victory over man's last and bitter foe. Surely with this even I or any man can and must become contemporary in faith, and no one who by an accident of time happened to be living close enough to Joseph's tomb to get a look into it would have any advantage over me or any other man today who is confronted by his own dying as the wages of his sin and who, moreover, sees what part he himself has played in the crucifixion of love incarnate on Calvary's hill. Here I must be transformed in my existence and I must die with Christ if I would live with him. I must, as he was, be utterly forsaken, and have absolutely nothing to which to cling. I must have no refuge except in God.

II

I have now stated what I believe to be the heart of the matter and what I believe I can go along with. This I believe to be the proclamation of the Gospel. Whether or not this is in harmony with Bultmann's view I cannot say. If he goes beyond this or says less than this, I cannot follow him.

Of one thing I am certain. Bultmann does not make the mistake of reducing the Gospel either to timeless truths or to ordinary historical events. He insists on the event which transforms the believer in his existence and causes him each day to be born anew to faith and love. Here at least he is Lutheran and takes seriously both the justification by grace alone through faith and the *simul justus et peccator*.

If everything may be dissolved into anthropology and the real saving events disappear into thin air, and if all that you can say in the end is that the Christ event is that event which causes me to come to a true understanding of myself and my existence and to come to be my true self in the right God-relation of trust and love, then I cannot go along. Then the objective basis for the preacher's message would be gone. By all means the objective events must be proclaimed. Sin was atoned for. God and man were reconciled. The victory over the powers to which God himself had subjected man was actually won by the act of God in Christ. All this transpired whether or not I believe it. But, as Aulén, too, insists, revelation and faith are strict corollaries. It is wrong to pit objective against subjective because, as Brunner points out, truth must here be conceived as personal correspondence and not as the correspondence of an idea in the mind with something outside the mind. It is a mistake to oppose the *fides qua creditur* to the *fides quae creditur*. These are both one. It is like the old question about whether or not there is a sound when a tree falls where there is no one to hear it. To be sure, there are vibrations of the air, but where there is no ear to hear and no brain to interpret that sound to a living being, there is no sound, if by a sound you mean what a living being hears through the ear. And just so nothing is revealed where there is no one to whom it is revealed. God cannot impart himself where there is no one to whom to do so. Hence the so-called objective events do not stand in isolation, and Kierkegaard's maxims that "subjectivity is truth" and "only the truth which edifies is true for me" retain their validity.

Moreover, with this orientation there is never a mere knowledge of these saving facts to which at some later time I may give assent and then, some time still later, finally get around to trusting in them. The saving event, the real knowledge, the personal correspondence is inseparable from the act of surrender in faith, and this holds also for the offense which is equally an existential communication.

When Bultmann says that the New Testament was influenced by Jewish apocalyptic and by the Gnostic savior myths, I think this must be admitted, but then it must also be clear that this is the situation to which the Gospel is addressed and that it is precisely these notions in the situation which are both corrected and fulfilled. When, furthermore, he holds that certain notions (such as a sacrifice for sin, a satisfying expiation, the notion that death is the wages of sin) are not meaningful to modern man, I should also in part disagree. What is involved in each case is something which no man, be he in the first or the twentieth century, will allow unless an inner transformation has already taken place. There is mythological language here, and this must be interpreted. Perhaps this is all that Bultmann means. For example, I cannot simply say that the fact that there is death in the world is due to man's sin. *There was death in the world even before the first man's sin or it was not this world.* Moreover, it is quite impossible to imagine what life in space and time would be like if there were no dying and everything from microbe to dinosaur just kept on living. This assertion must therefore be interpreted, and not in such a way that it comes to be the bearer of a universal truth, for this is an existential proposition and it gives expression to what God means to tell me, me personally, by my dying.

Likewise modern man may rightly object to a crude notion of influencing a god by means of a sacrifice, but he also knows very well what the worshiper means to express with his sacrifice of thanksgiving or with the guilt offering of blood. He can see what is behind the desire to make satisfaction and so to escape a righteous wrath. And if he cannot see it, then it must be due to the fact that he does not realize what it means to be a responsible creature before a holy God, and he must therefore be confronted by this holy God in that Christ who so fearfully denounces the scribes and Pharisees and with a whip drives out the money-changers.

Finally I have some reservations about Bultmann's definition of

mythology as applied to the Old Testament concept of God's holiness Here transcendence (*Jenseitigkeit*) is certainly conceived as something other than mere distance in space. Awareness of the holiness of God makes him the "totally other" in the midst of all anthropomorphisms The holiness of God is neither a metaphysical nor a merely moralistic designation. It is *sui generis*. God is thrice holy, and before him the sinner is utterly undone. He can have nothing to do with the sinner Moreover, he is never once to be identified with any earthly thing or person. Yet this Holy One of Israel comes to his people, and he is everywhere, not dwelling in temples made with hands. Nowhere is this presence of God more grippingly portrayed than in Psalm 104, which depicts his gracious presence in the masks of the creatures, or in Psalm 139, which depicts the absolute impossibility of escaping or hiding from the living God. "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me. It is high, I cannot attain unto it." So there is a positive preparation for the coming of Christ among the Jews. It cannot be overlooked that it was Jews who regarded bowing down to any creature as blasphemy who should make the confession, "Jesus is Lord." It is therefore not true that Jesus could just as well have appeared in 1954. This is useless because it is a hypothesis contrary to fact. He appeared in the fullness of time when God had prepared the way for him.

III

Now, in conclusion I do not intend to outline a sermon, but want to give some indication of what and how one preaches when the witness is to the redemptive event which is able to save man from the powers that enslave him and make him a new man in Christ, and not to some merely historical event or some authenticating pseudo-miracle How, for example, shall we preach on the stilling of the storm without either making people turn away in incredulity or scorn from such mesmerism or else causing them to admire our clever allegorizing That something actually happened to give rise to this witness I would be the last to deny. In preaching this can simply be taken for granted It would be fatal to say that this event never happened. But then it must be made quite explicit that this story, as it is told, is the witness of faith; it is post-Easter and post-Pentecost, after eyes had been opened and bonds of the tongue unleashed. So what does it say? It says that the disciples, while he was with them, did not recognize him for what

he was. They did not have serenity of faith in him when he was their companion in the storm. Not only for them, ignorant fishermen of a pre-scientific age when scientific meteorology was not yet known, but also for us and for all men the vagaries of weather and the perils of the sea are symbols of the insecurity of our earthly existence. What is so unstable as the sea into whose depths the proudest ship will eventually sink! The cruel sea! But here is one whom winds and seas obey. No devious explanations, no long, roundabout way which begins in the immeasurable past and eventually arrives at a result via an interminable series. No! This is lordship. This is imperious command exacting instant obedience. "He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast." Here, then, is ultimate security. Here is One whom winds and seas obey and who is the Lord with whom one is safe in the midst of the greatest insecurity.

But you cannot have this One with you as you would have a burly and blustering captain with you. You can have him with you only in faith, only counter to all appearance. Jesus lies there and is asleep, exhausted from his labors, and yet just he, whose labor was love even to the point of utter exhaustion, is the One whom winds and seas obey. He it is who comes to their aid when they despair completely of their own devices, *for surely they as sturdy seamen had done everything first to save themselves.* "Lord, save us, we perish." And then his reprimand that strikes us all where we are most vulnerable, "Why are ye fearful, o ye of little faith?" Here is the real crux: to escape out of the anxiety of the human situation which is always and everywhere as precarious as this boat tossed over its 70,000 fathoms—to escape from this predicament into faith and then, even when you are rowing like mad for shore, to live no longer out of that over which you have control but altogether by faith in him whom winds and seas obey, even though now he lies asleep and pays no heed to your peril.

So we must come to the end of our rope and find our only refuge in our Lord, not caring in the end whether we sink or swim, as long as we know that we are obedient. And we must do this, viz., come to the end of our rope, not only when the storms are raging, when sickness torments us, or when death at last stares us in the face as we look back upon threescore years and ten and know the end of the journey near, but at all times when in the midst of life we are in death. We must do so not only when we are actually, physically, and materially

down and out, but also when we are most comfortable with air-coolers and vitamin pills and weather maps and nevertheless realize that we are nothing before God. We must do so not only when we have actually killed our brother and with Cain cry out that our punishment is greater than we can bear, or when with Lady Macbeth we pace the floor and in vain try to blot out the unblottable, but just then when we are most prone to preen ourselves in our own righteousness. Then, too, we must cry, "Lord save us, we perish." Here is a Lord who not only commands the winds and the waves, not only commands the diseases like soldiers rising from their bivouac, but also has power to forgive sins because he covers them with his own suffering love.

So there is ultimate refuge and security only in the God who comes to us in Jesus Christ. Nor must we interpret the story only with respect to the *eschaton,* in the sense of the end of time, when in the resurrection of the dead and the new heaven and the new earth there shall be no more sea and a real end of insecurity, but *even in the here and now* there is always the possibility for faith that the storm should cease and we be safe while others flounder. "He arose and rebuked the winds and the waves and there was a great calm," and this was the gift of his grace. It was not coerced from him by a novena. It was an absolute miracle for which those who witness it in faith can only give thanks in obedience.

Grundtvig and Mythology

By Johannes Knudsen

WELL OVER A CENTURY before the current interest in mythology in the realm of New Testament interpretation N. F. S. Grundtvig was intensely taken up with a study of myths. His interest was centered in Nordic mythology and it was originally inspired by the new concern for this field which was engendered by Romanticism and the pre-Romantic movement in northern Europe. If this study had been concerned only with the technical aspects of mythology, there would be no reason for a discussion of his views in a theological journal. The fact is, however, that Grundtvig's use of myths far transcended the historical or technical aspects. They became the vehicle for far-reaching interpretations of culture and religion which were related to his view of man and of revelation. While these interpretations were not directly applied to the field of New Testament interpretation, which is the current interest of theology, they nevertheless presage the present interests in an important manner. It is therefore, I believe, of interest to become acquainted with them.

As a young man of twenty-five Grundtvig published his first, short (two-hundred-page) study of mythology in 1808. It was mostly a technical study of the sources and a presentation of the content according to a critical review of the sources. At that time Grundtvig looked at mythology as a cosmological drama which had been registered in the literature of the medieval world as an evidence of the religion and culture of the ancient Nordic peoples. After this study he dropped mythology and for more than two decades turned to other activities. The study was then renewed, and in 1832 he published a major work, also called "Nordic Mythology" but of twice the scope (550 pages) of the other. It is in this work, particularly in the 170-page introduction, that he presents his basic ideas of mythology and other important matters. Incidentally, it was here that he first launched his plan for a folk school and made his first fervent plea for freedom in spiritual matters. In the meantime his views of man and of history had, in certain respects, undergone radical changes, and it is necessary to bring

this development into the picture in order to understand his treatment of myths.

In 1810-1811, or two years after the publication of his first mythology, Grundtvig experienced a deep religious crisis, the outcome of which was a soul-shaking conversion. He reacted strongly to the religious ideas of Idealism and Romanticism, with which he had identified himself, and he returned to traditional and orthodox Lutheranism, tinged with Pietism, which had been the religion of his father and of himself in his childhood days. He entered the ministry and for a number of years considered himself a crusader for the conversion of the people. He believed that only through such a conversion to a positive Christian faith could the people be saved, and he fervently demanded a return to old-fashioned Christianity as represented by Martin Luther and his view of the Bible as the Word of God. The death of his father, whom he had assisted, and the failure to obtain a pastorate in Copenhagen took him out of the ministry again, however, and made it necessary for him to turn to other activities for several years. He spent his time in historical and literary activity, subsisting on a scholarship from the king, and for a time he even turned his crusading activity to historical writing.

From early childhood history had held an absorbing interest for Grundtvig. It might be said that history was second in his interest only to the church and its faith, but even this statement is inaccurate. History was not only the vehicle for an expression of his theology and his view of life; it was closely integrated into his theology. His historical production was fabulous, including mythological studies, translation of medieval classics of the North, research work in Anglo-Saxon, and direct historical writings. In the field of Beowulf research he is even today recognized as one of the outstanding scholars whose contributions in many respects have stood the test of time. He wrote "World Chronicles" in 1812, 1814, and 1817. In 1833 he published the first volume of a "History of the World," which was continued in two subsequent volumes. He never wrote a history of his own country, nor a church history, although he did write interpretative presentations of the history of the church.

The "World Chronicles" established the basic character of Grundtvig's view of history. It was a view which he had inherited from

Luther.[1] He had learned to know Luther in his father's library, where he found a translation of a Luther biography by Benjamin Lindner (1748). Included in this work was a translation of Luther's Commentary on Genesis. Briefly, the view which Grundtvig held can be expressed in the short statement that "God is the Lord of history." This is even apparent in pre-studies for the "Chronicle" of 1812, extant in manuscript form, where the words of Ephesians 1:10 are quoted and the plan or the *oikonomia* of God through the ages is discussed. Frequently in his writings he states that the events of history are evidences of the work of God's hand. With this basic assumption he then wrote the "Chronicle" of 1812, which was to prove this contention but which was also to be a vehicle of his crusade for a return of the Danish people to God. From a technical point of view the "Chronicle" was one-sided and biased, full of errors and omissions. Grundtvig admitted this eventually. At the time, however, he considered the testimony to the truth of revelation far more important than historical objectivity. When it was pointed out to him that he had not told the truth about historical events, he countered with the assertion that the Gospel is the truth.

As mentioned, Grundtvig admitted his professional error later on, and he remedied it by publishing his "History of the World," in which he not only made a strong effort to be fair and professional but also paid tribute to the rising emphasis on historical criticism. He had come to see that testimony to the Gospel through historical material and professional competence as an historian are two separate concerns. He never gave up his conviction that God is the Lord of history and that historical events bear evidence to the work of God's hand. This view is always basic in his philosophy of history. He learned, however, that this faith can be witnessed and proclaimed but that it cannot be proved even by the history which is the result of the power of God.

The development of this understanding forms not only an interesting part of his general theology, but it is basic for his understanding of mythology. It has an important connection with his view of revelation, authority, and the church, but we shall attempt to describe it here apart from these main features. As Michelsen has demonstrated, this development of the historical view was related to Luther's con-

1 William Michelsen, *Tilblivelsen af Grundtvigs Historiesyn*, 1954, has pointed this out. I am indebted to his analysis in the first part of this paper.

ception of history, revelation, and salvation, and from Michelsen's documentation we shall describe the process.

Luther believed that "history is at once a revelation and a masking of God."[2] The events of history cannot be taken as evidence of revelation but as evidence of the power of sin and of the devil in man. This view was formed in reaction against Augustine, who maintained that the Roman Church and the City of God were identical, and it was polemically turned against the whole Roman conception of history and the church. In the medieval conception "the church was a visible revelation of the kingdom of God. This is evident in the worship, in the hierarchical structure of the church, but also in the philosophical perception of God. . . . Luther protested on all three fronts, and on every front he maintained the hidden character of God."[3] God was *verborgen;* he was *deus absconditus.*

While sharing Luther's emphasis upon *soli deo gloria,* Grundtvig did not share Luther's view of the hidden God. He believed that God was active and evident in history. This has major significance, and it is an integral part of Grundtvig's theology. It is impossible within our limited task to account for all the factors which created it, but it did to some extent grow out of the situation in which Grundtvig found himself. "For Luther it was important to emphasize that God was hidden because the church and theology had adopted a false knowledge of God with the help of philosophy. For Grundtvig it was important to assert as loudly as possible that God was revealed because philosophy and theology in fine agreement had obscured God for the common man."[4] Luther was pitted against medieval scholasticism. Grundtvig was up against the Idealism and Rationalism of the eighteenth century. Luther and Grundtvig were agreed that God could not be known through the power of reason, but it was Grundtvig's "conviction that it was really possible to see the effects of God's hand in history."[5]

Michelsen carries this difference of view in regard to God's activity in history back to a difference in anthropology, and this again to a difference in the conception of creation. To take the latter first, Grundtvig maintained that "creation has taken place once and for all. It is the primary and basic fact by which all his historical presenta-

2 *Op. cit.,* p. 128.
3 *Op. cit.,* p. 130.
4 *Op. cit.,* p. 150.
5 *Op. cit.,* p. 130.

tions are introduced. For Luther creation is continued and repeated."[6] As documentation Michelsen quotes Luther's commentary on the "Magnificat": "Denn zu gleich, als ym anfang aller Creaturn er die welt ausz nichts schuff, davon er schepffer und almechtig heysset, szo bleibt er solcher art zu wircken unvorwandelt, und sein noch alle seine werck bisz ansz ende der welt alszo gethan, das er ausz dem, das nichts, gering, voracht, elend, tod ist, etwas kostlich, ehrlich, selig, lebendig macht. . . ."[7] Man, who through the fall had become nothing, is recreated by God in salvation, just as God originally created the world "from nothing." With this point of view Grundtvig does not agree. For him creation has taken place once and for all. It is not the creation which is repeated, but it is the fall that occurs constantly through history. Creation is the one great and basic fact which can never be erased, either by man or the devil. No matter how deep the fall is, man always retains a memory of his creation in the image of God.

In basic tenets of the faith, in their belief in creation, in the image of God, and in salvation by the grace of God through the death and resurrection of Christ, Luther and Grundtvig agree. Their emphases are different, however, even as their historical situation was different. This led Grundtvig to place stress upon God's activity in history while Luther emphasized the fact of salvation. In the consideration of the cross and Easter morning their historical situations also caused them to differ in emphasis. Luther emphasized the cross while Grundtvig emphasized the resurrection. For Luther the resurrection was viewed in the light of the cross and for Grundtvig the cross was viewed in the light of the resurrection. Their agreement was basic; their difference in emphasis was to a large extent caused by different polemical situations. The dissimilarity that grows out of the present situation is thus not found in the realm of Christology or soteriology. Neither is it found in the evaluation of creation itself. It lies in anthropology, in the view of man and sin.

Luther and Grundtvig started with the common assumption that man was created in the image of God. Luther believed that this image was *"umbkommen,"*[8] that it was gone, and that when man was saved from the power of sin and the devil he was again created *"ausz nichts."*

6 *Op. cit.*, p. 130.
7 *Op. cit.*, p. 131. *WA*, 7, 547.
8 *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

Through the fall man assumed the image of the devil.[9] He is "gering, voracht, elend, tod." "For Luther creation was a continuously progressive matter, while the fall was a completed event which determined the character of human nature prior to all history. For Grundtvig the opposite was true. Creation was the first fact of history and the fall was a progressive process."[10] Grundtvig emphasized strongly the creation of man in the image of God, and while he in no wise minimized the fall and the power of sin, he did not believe that the image of God was completely obliterated. A remnant of creation in God's image was left, a memory, a longing after God. Man had an "aptitude," a *dispositiva qualitas,* to be filled with the grace of God.[11] In his old age Grundtvig speaks of this response of man in passive terms. "In this presentation of the relationship of fallen man to God and to the image of God within himself, it will easily be seen that all thought of merit, of self-justification, and of help and power to save oneself falls away, while the *readiness to be comforted, be pardoned, be reborn, and be renewed* has been retained."

This is one of the major points where Grundtvig moves away from or beyond traditional Lutheranism. In the mind of his followers he breaks with a medievalism which had been retained in Lutheranism to the detriment of the function of the church in society. He makes bold to proclaim that man, who was created in the image of God, still retains that image in his natural state. He agreed with Luther that man was a sinner and that the greatest expression of sin was pride. Man was disobedient to God; he was in rebellion. But Grundtvig maintained that by virtue of his creation man was nevertheless a creature of God in whom all good had not been obliterated. Man could not fulfill his purpose and could only be saved from the power of sin and death through the grace of God in Christ Jesus, but he was still the creature through whom God acts in history. The great and distinguishing mark of creation was not, as in Thomism (to which there is a superficial resemblance), human reason, but the human word which is the dynamic, human counterpart of God's creative Word.

In the three "World Chronicles" Grundtvig, the youthful crusader

9 *Op. cit.,* p. 157.

10 *Op. cit.,* p. 160.

11 Regin Prenter has shown in *Kirke og Kultur,* 1948 (Michelsen, p. 169), how Grundtvig got this idea from Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio.*

for the Gospel, had written history from a soteriological point of view. God is the Lord of history and he has acted through the history of man. Therefore, history can be used to proclaim the truth of God's salvation. Grundtvig acted on this principle and in so doing he abused historical writing by ignoring the objective presentation of facts and by twisting historical material to suit his crusading purpose. In one sense the "Chronicles" were magnificent, for they proclaimed the author's Christian faith and elaborated the thesis that God is the Lord of history. In another sense they were a grotesque mistake, for they attempted to use historical material not only as a means of proclamation but also as a proof of the validity of the Gospel. As Grundtvig clarified his thoughts and emancipated himself from servitude to traditional Lutheranism, which had characterized the first years after his conversion, he realized the fallacy of his procedure. He still believed that God is the Lord of history and that the events of history demonstrate God's action through man, but he came to see that the Gospel cannot thus be proclaimed and demonstrated. The Gospel is a living Word from God which can be believed and which can be proclaimed. But it cannot be demonstrated or proved, and the attempt to do this violates the character of the Gospel as well as that of history. The Gospel belongs to the church. It is a Word of salvation which needs no proof and which is violated by the attempt to prove it or demonstrate it. The story of God's action through man in history is a matter of faith. The presentation of historical facts is a matter of science and education. Faith in God's guidance cannot be scientifically substantiated, and it is violated by the attempt to do this. History must be emancipated from the Gospel, and the Gospel must be emancipated from historical writing. Because he saw this Grundtvig's last major historical work was a "History of the World from the Best Sources." Such a work was necessary, he believed, for only when we understand the history of state, society, and culture can we understand the history of the church, but it must be written impartially and for educational purposes. "I have gradually learned how to distinguish between church and school, faith and science, the temporal and the eternal."[12]

Christian faith will result, however, in a view of life, an *Anskuelse* (*Anschauung*). It is the biblical world view, and Grundtvig includes the Old Testament in the view. He calls it the Mosaic-Christian

12 Introduction to "History of the World," 1833.

Anskuelse. This *Anskuelse* is not the Gospel, but the fruit of the Gospel, and for this reason it can be adjusted to changing situations. The Gospel never changes. It is independent of all change. It does not stand or fall with changing situations. But the *Anskuelse* of Christians, while based on the Gospel's proclamation of God's creative Word which is at work in the world, speaks in and to changing world situations. With the help of this view man can interpret history and can influence history. The dynamic for action comes only through God's living Word, which is Christ in his church, but understanding is not identical with the Gospel which motivates it. No act, no attitude, no point of view can be identified with Christianity or with the Gospel, the saving grace of God which restores man to his right relationship to God and grants him newness of life.

While the Mosaic-Christian *Anskuelse* is a fruit of the Gospel, the fact that man has an *Anskuelse* at all is a fruit of his creation in the image of God. All men of spirit form a view of life, and they have spirit because they are creatures of God. Our *Anskuelse* is Mosaic-Christian, but we must not identify it with the Gospel. The Gospel is a living, saving Word from God, and it must not be reduced to identity with a view of life. In fact, all attempts to demonstrate or verify or prove the Gospel violate the Gospel and reduce it from a divine and dynamic to a static and human thing.

At this point Grundtvig ends his all-out battle with the enemies of the Gospel. Up to this point he had condemned them as enemies of Christianity and had refused to cooperate with them in any respect. Now he makes peace with the "naturalists," as he calls the opponents of the Gospel, and declares his willingness to cooperate with them in human affairs, in society, and in politics. The Gospel is a living Word of the church, but the affairs of men are matters of state and education. All men are creatures of God and have within them, by virtue of their divine creation, the power to work for good. If they have a wrong view of life, they should be opposed by those who have the Mosaic-Christian view, but they should not be condemned. In secular affairs we must work in secular ways, guided by our Mosaic-Christian view, but work together with all men who work for good. Man's fall, sin, and salvation are matters of faith which concern the church, but there is a vital difference between faith and the view of life which guides us in common human affairs.

These ideas were expressed in the introduction to "Nordic Mythology," 1832, and so they lead us back to a consideration of mythology. Nordic mythology was no longer considered by Grundtvig to be the literary expression of a cosmological drama, as in 1808. It was now the expression of the world view of the ancient pre-Christian North. Inasmuch as the ancient Nordics were sound and strong people, their world view reflects to an unusual degree the concepts of life and death which could arise in men who are creatures of God.

Grundtvig starts with the assumption that myths are picture language, that they are imagery. They constitute a mirror for natural, every-day, human life, which is reflected faithfully and poetically. The life they reflect is the God-given life with which man has been endowed in creation. Created man is not only a physical man (i.e., an animal), but he is also a marvelous creature who has been given the gift of the spirit. Grundtvig calls man a "divine experiment which demonstrates how spirit and dust can interpenetrate each other and be expressed in a common, divine consciousness."[13] The expression of the spirit will always be a living power. For Grundtvig a living word is a spoken word. When it is reduced to writing it loses its vital, dynamic character, for the word of man, human speech, is the divine gift which endows man with the spirit and which expresses the image of God who created by his mighty Word. This does not mean that the word cannot be written, nor that a written word has no power. It simply means that in order to be truly creative and dynamic a word must be spoken by a living person to other living persons. This is reflected in the history of the church, where life has ebbed and flowed as the living word of the Gospel has had free course or not.

Myths are inspired words of power which reflect the natural (i.e., the created) spiritual life of man. Such a word may be spoken in one people and in one situation, but it has universal application, for the life of man is universal. This means, then, that myths have messages for us today if they come to us in a living way. "If myths of every people form a satisfactory expression and the real temple of its spirit, they are to this extent prophetic in that they foretell what will happen and must happen to the people."[14] The spirit of myths may be dead for us, but it can be revived through a people's understanding of poetry as

13 Introduction to "Nordic Mythology," p. 22.
14 *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

long as imagery is alive in folk-sayings, proverbs, and the like.[15] Whenever the spirit of myths has been kept alive in a people, they can speak to us. Grundtvig finds that this is true especially in two mythologies, the Greek and the Nordic. In their youthful dreams these two people were prophetic.

Myths thus form an inspired expression of the understanding and aspirations of a people in its youthful beginning. The inspiration comes from the fact of creation in the image of God, and a people will, in response to this creation, strive to ascend to the heaven whence it has its origin. No people has reached heaven, but the reason for this does not lie in the inspiration and aspiration. It lies in the fall, which has prevented the people from translating their inspiration and aspiration into action. As history shows us, inspiration has been translated into intellectualism rather than action, and this has made it powerless, for intellectualism explains rather than acts. The aspiration to ascend to heaven failed for the Greeks, and Greek intellectualism, expressed especially in Aristotle, has bound and shackled the action of Western man ever since. Intellectualism can never be dynamic.

The aspiration to ascend to heaven succeeded only in the ascension of Jesus Christ, who had descended from heaven. This is the Gospel. The Christian *Anskuelse,* which is the fruit of the Gospel, proclaims this ascent into heaven, and insofar as the Gospel is dynamic and is received in faith, its understanding will be reflected in the Christian *Anskuelse.* The Gospel does not depend upon this formulation of an *Anskuelse.* It is received in a faith which believes that Christ ascended into heaven *for us* and *with us.* Our understanding of this is not important, but our faith in it is all-important.

Here emerges the difference from those whom Grundtvig called "naturalists," the secular philosophers. He was willing to work with them in secular affairs, but he believed that they lacked the dynamic of faith. For the "naturalists"—or shall we say the intellectualists?—the ascension is a testimony to a possibility. It is a prototype which must be understood intellectually and then imitated. We can not deny the intellectualist the right to have this opinion, even as he in turn must not deny the fact of the ascension of Christ in which we believe, but the result of this situation is that the Christian realizes that intellectual understanding of the ascension is not important. Such understanding

15 *Op. cit.,* p. 55.

concerns only our secular life. Eternal life grows out of faith. The intellectualist, on the other hand, must maintain that intellectual understanding and the explanation of the ascension is a necessary requirement for eternal life. Thus Grundtvig establishes the relation of faith and explanation.

It is precisely at this point that Grundtvig's ideas become pertinent for our modern interest in the *mythos* of the New Testament. As a rule he did not apply the term to the New Testament, and he would undoubtedly have acted strongly against any suggestion of "demythologization." But he maintained that myths are images which reflect the truths of life. They are forms in which truth is expressed. The form might be called poetic insofar as poetry is its servant, but it far transcends our modern use of the term "poetic," for it is a dynamic and prophetic word. It not only conveys ideas; it is life-giving. Behind it lies a faith. The faith begets the form, yet the two are not identical. The form may be analyzed and rationalized, but this does not affect the truth and the faith. Yet it is only in the image of myth that truth can be conveyed.

In one place in the introduction to "Nordic Mythology" Grundtvig does mention the New Testament. He asks the question: Why do we need myths when we have the Christian view of life? And he adds: Why do we need the clouds and the stars when we have the sun and the moon? The answer to the second question is obvious: the clouds and the stars have necessary albeit secondary functions. "Christianity has no other peculiar imagery than the parables of Jesus and what emerges from the story of his life, but this belongs to the church and to the church school and is applicable only to our course toward eternal life. We also have an earthly course, however, which must be considered in the light of the spirit. Our soul as well as our body has worldly needs for which the Creator intends us to work, illumined by the light he has lighted for us and endowed with the power which he grants. He gave manna to his people in the desert, but he did not do this in a fertile land where people could sow and reap a harvest."

Louis Kossuth and the American Churches

By Andor M. Leffler

Oh great Kossuth here every heart
Contains for thee a shrine
Where fervent prayers are offered up
For the rights of thee and thine.

We honor age, we reverence one
In whom so brightly shine
The virtues which made Washington
Appear almost divine.

THE little poem with its religious sentiment was written by Malvina A. Wily, a pupil of the Normal School of Philadelphia, for a contest held among the school children on Dec. 26, 1851, when Louis Kossuth, Hungarian patriot, visited the city during his American tour.[1] The winner of the first prize, one John L. Painter, was given the honor of delivering his address before Kossuth in the Old Chinese Museum.[2] This essay gives us some idea of what the judges considered important in the career of Louis Kossuth. The "prize essay" declared:

> Great man, we honour you for your virtues and sentiments, we have read you were in favor of that which every true American cherishes dearer than life, that is "the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and opposed to a union of Church and State." For such republican doctrines, every man is respected: and he who gives utterance to others is detested.[3]

Indeed, both of the above mentioned "republican doctrines" were in the foreground during the Hungarian struggle for freedom. From 1832 on, both houses of the Hungarian Diet made repeated efforts to cor-

1 P. H. Skinner, ed., *The Welcome of Louis Kossuth, Governor of Hungary, to Philadelphia, by the Youth* (Philadelphia: Joseph A. Wilson, 1852), 38.

2 *Ibid.*, vii.

3 *Ibid.*, xi.

rect those humiliating laws passed in the infamous *Carolina Resolutio,*[4] which practically made Hungarian Protestantism a religion of the underground. It is true that some liberal concessions had been made by Joseph II, yet both Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches of Hungary remained only tolerated sects until Article XX of the Constitution of 1848 established complete equality and freedom of all religions.[5] Members of the Hungarian Diet, regardless of their religious affiliations, were fighting for complete religious liberty. In truth, the great majority of the Catholic members of the Diet were in the foreground of this fight.[6] This was freely admitted by Kossuth in his speech at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Dec. 16, 1851, when he said, "Roman Catholics took the lead in the struggle for religious liberty; . . . they were not acting as Catholic bishops, but only as members of Parliament."[7] Unfortunately the official Catholic position resisted both the growing liberal tendency, and more particularly the extension of those privileges to the Protestants that only the Catholic Church enjoyed. The Diets, beginning in 1832, proposed laws on "freedom of conscience," but since the bills had to be signed by the king before they could become law, it was a simple matter for the princes of the church to put pressure on the court to delay indefinitely the sanctioning of these laws.[8] This was all the more feasible since the dynasty, under the influence of the so-called "Viennese Romanticism," identified its own safety with that of the Roman Catholic Church.[9]

Louis Kossuth himself became a "test-case" in this fight. According to the laws of 1790, all mixed marriages had to be performed by Roman Catholic priests. The situation was further aggravated by the fact that the functioning priest often refused to bless mixed marriages due to the unwillingness of the Protestant party to make some requested concessions in favor of the Catholic Church. When the Lu-

4 The *Carolina Resolutio* and edict of King Charles III of Hungary of March 21, 1731, ordered the Protestant clergy to be placed under the "spiritual supervision" of the Catholic hierarchy: their churches were restricted to certain limited territories, and Protestants living outside of these territories were ordered to accept the spiritual ministration of the Roman clergy.

5 *Harangszo* (organ of Hungarian Protestants in exile) published in Munich, March 15, 1948.

6 Horváth Mihály, *Huszonötéy Magyarország Történetéböl* (Budapest, in 1886), II, 176.

7 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 19, 1851.

8 Zsilinszky Mihaly, *A Magyarhoni Protestáns Egyház Története* (Budapest: Athenseum, 1907), 649.

9 Farkas Gyula, *A Fiatal Magyarorszag Kora* (Budapest: Magyar Szemle Tarsasag, 1932), 110. During the rule of the liberal Joseph II (1780-1790) the close friendship between Rome and the dynasty was broken, and was not re-established until the rule of Francis I (1792-1835).

theran Louis Kossuth married the Roman Catholic Theresia Meszlenyi, a parish priest in Budapest refused to bless the union. Since the proposed laws of the Diet forbidding this interference with mixed marriages were never sanctioned, the local courts of Pest County provinces attempted to prosecute. The county instructed its district attorney to bring the priest before the law on the ground that he neglected his duty as an employee of the state. The priest was fined 600 forints, but the case was appealed to the highest courts at Vienna, where it was promptly forgotten.[10] The continuous appeals of the hierarchy to Vienna were greatly resented by the nation. Popular sentiment did not look upon these matters as religious issues but simply as a fight between liberals and reactionaries.[11]

After the Kossuth "test-case," many of the counties started similar proceedings in their local courts. Popular pressure become so great that in 1844 an edict was issued by the king which legalized mixed marriages performed before Protestant clergymen, thus eliminating further controversy.[12]

Kossuth, however, was far more than a passive "test-case" in the religious issues of Hungary. Early in 1829, as council secretary of the Lutheran Church at Satoral jaujhely, he introduced the following resolution: "In order to foster the spread of nationalization [Hungarianization] within this congregation, it is being proposed that henceforth the sermon is to be preached only in the Hungarian language. The service of Holy Communion, however, should be conducted in Hungarian, German, and Slovak."[13] With Louis Kossuth and the Rev. Joseph Szekacs, of Oroshaza, in the lead, the Lutheran Church of Hungary began a Hungarianization program both in its churches and in its schools. Since a goodly number of the Lutheran constituents were Slovaks and Germans, there was strong resentment against this policy. One Slovak Lutheran complained bitterly:

> The same Kossuth who in the *Pesti Hirlap* is fighting for equality before the law, in the Lutheran synodical meetings attacks those who are looking for their equality and wants to punish them. The Kossuth who seems to fight for freedom in the press, in the synod proposes that the Slovak youth should be forbidden to

10 Zsilinszky, *op. cit.*, 650f.
11 Farkas, *op. cit.*
12 Zsilinszky, *op. cit.*, 651.
13 *Uj Harangszo* (Gyor, Hungary), Sept. 12, 1948.

study their own language. The Kossuth who sings panegyrics about those who serve their country, wants to remove from their office people with the same ambition. This is his liberty, this is his liberalism. We have a different concept of liberty and liberalism. In the dictionary of Kossuth and company those words have different meanings.[14]

The strong resistance of the Lutheran Slovaks and Germans against Hungarianization prompted Kossuth and other Hungarian leaders of the Lutheran Church to propose an organizational union with the Calvinist Church of Hungary. Since the Calvinist Church's constituency was almost exclusively Hungarian, it was hoped that the unfavorable balance of nationalities in the Lutheran Church would be overcome by this type of union. His *Pesti Hirlap* (the first Hungarian Daily newspaper) vigorously fought for the union.[15] However, the Calvinists had no such pressing necessity for the union, so it never materialized. The Catholic Church did not look with favor either on the strong nationalistic movement or on the desire to create a united Protestantism. They also realized that one of the moving spirits in both instances was Louis Kossuth.[16]

A further break between the official Catholic position and the liberal spirit of the nation came because of differences in the secondary and higher schools. In the early part of the nineteenth century, as a reaction against Rationalism, the new Catholic school curriculum very cautiously excluded the rising spirit of nationalism from its secondary schools or seminaries. At the Catholic *Gymnasium* at Eger, for instance, they introduced a complete spy system in order to force the students to speak Latin even outside of school hours. In the Calvinist *Gymnasium* at Papa, Charles Kerkapolyi wrote an essay on "Why is the Hungarian Nation Backward?" But in the Catholic *Gymnasium* at Eger, Gedeon Mindszenty received a prize for an essay entitled "The Good Shepherd."[17] During the early decades of the "Young Hungary" movement, Catholics were the leaders in writing liberal literature. Because of the unfavorable official stand of the church, later Catholic writers either broke with the liberal movement or became strongly anticlerical. The

14 Kornis Gyula, *A Magyar Muvelodes Eszmenyei*, 1777-1848 (Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1927), II, 126.

15 Kossuth Lajos, "Unio," *Pesti Hirlap*, March 3, 1841.

16 Racz Kalman, "Unio torekvesek a megyvenes evekben," in *Protestans Szemle* (1897), 361 ff.

17 Farkas, *op. cit.*, 111 f.

break between the official Catholic stand and the popular sentiment of the nation was complete by the 1840's when the new generation, trained in the liberal Protestant secondary schools, began to agitate openly and indiscriminately against the Catholic clergy as servants of absolutism and enemies of liberal nationalism. The *Pesti Hirlap* under Kossuth's editorship faithfully served Protestantism and liberalism and at the same time almost daily attacked the Catholic clergy, especially since the much hated power of censorship was in their hands.[18] Bertalan Szemere, one of the leaders of "Young Hungary," declared in 1843: "The flower of the nation, that is, the high aristocracy and the princes of the church, are not natural growths on the tree of a nation, but are artificial flowers having neither fragrance nor fruit. We must wait the fall season when the winds will carry away these pretended flowers."[19]

Article XX of the 1848 Constitution not only provided religious freedom, but at the same time incorporated the principle that the administration and the support of the schools belong to the state. There was a great deal of resentment against this policy not only in Catholic but also in Protestant circles—to such an extent that Eotvos, the minister of education in the Batthyanyi ministry, gave up the idea of carrying through this provision. Nevertheless, excitement reached a new height when at the first state convention of the "nationalized" public school teachers, Lajos Tavasi declared: "During the last centuries the priests divided us. In the present and in the future the school teacher will unite us. Is this not the meaning of the United Educational Law passed by Parliament? In reality there is no longer a need for the church since man can find satisfaction in the free, equal, and brotherly state."[20]

At the outbreak of open hostilities with Austria the Batthyanyi ministry resigned and Kossuth took over. In order to pacify church circles, he appointed Michael Horvath, Catholic bishop of Csanad, as minister of religion and education.[21] This act helped very little as far as the princes of the church were concerned, for Kossuth remained a true son of the Protestant anti-Catholic spirit of the age. His first

18 *Ibid.*, 116.

19 Vahot Imre, "A Dunai as Tiszai koltok Hazankban es Kazinczy Ferencz Muiskolaja," *Szivarvany* (Budapest, 1844 annual).

20 Kornis Gyula, *op. cit.*, 579.

21 Balassa Jozsef, *Kossuth Amerikaban* (Budapest, 1931), 69.

envoy to England after the Declaration of Independence in 1849 was none other than the agent of the British Bible Society in Hungary, a liberal Lutheran pastor of Felsolovos, the Rev. Gottlieb August Wimmer, who sold more than 150,000 Bibles in Hungary.[22] He was an agent of the British Bible Society since 1837 and attained notoriety as a violent anti-Catholic by the distribution of the Calw Church History,[23] a book filled with unflattering remarks about the Roman Catholic Church. Wimmer had some connection with the mission to the Jews at Budapest established by the Free Church of Scotland. During the War of Independence one of the converts of this institution, Philip Saphir, organized a Bible Colporteur Guard among the converts who "disseminated Bibles and Testaments in Hebrew, German, Magyar, and Croatian,"[24] causing no little concern to the Catholic clergy.

In 1849, during the days of the brief Roman republican era, Kossuth proposed to Mazzini that in order to protest against the anti-liberal stand of Pope Pius IX, the people of the city of Rome should turn Protestant in mass.[25] Kossuth fell in love with this idea and, writing to Garibaldi from London on Dec. 2, 1859, he persisted in this notion:

> As far as the pope is concerned, he is the personified opposition to Italian Unity! He could be easily disposed of. I believe that my idea, although many consider it visionary, would solve the problem simply and fundamentally. The "very Christian" and "apostolic" emperors are fighting each other as to which one could better keep the supremacy of the pope in Italy and under this pretense his own worldly power. Let them do it. But, in the meantime, let Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna turn to Protestantism. Let them be Lutherans, Congregationalists, Orthodox Greeks, Unitarians, Rationalists, Naturalists, Theists—whatever they wish—only they should cease to be Papists and the problem is ended forever.[26]

Despite his violent outbursts against the pope and the princes of the Roman Church, Kossuth was not looked upon as an enemy by the lay Catholics in Hungary. He stood on the ground that the church should not meddle in politics and the government should not interfere

22 Janossy Denes, *A Kossuth Emigracio Angliaban es Amerikaban* (Budapest: A Magyar Tortenelmi Tarsulat, 1940), I, 37.

23 Zsilinszky, *op. cit.*, 652.

24 *The Independent*, Feb. 5, 1852.

25 Hajnal Istvan, *A Kossuth Emigracio Torok Orszagban* (Budapest: A Magyar Tortenelmi Tarsulat, 1927), I, 139.

26 Kossuth Lajos, *Irataim az Emigraciobol* (Budapest: Athenaeum R. T., 1881), II, 344.

with the business of the church. Religion to him was not an institution but a matter of conscience. In Kossuth's opinion neither racial unity nor religion could be the basis for a national state, only its support. Civic and political rights were the only foundations of a state not despotic in principle. The Catholic Church was a strongly entrenched state religion in Hungary. It was inevitable that it was to meet bitter attacks from one holding the theory of complete separation of church and state. Kossuth was supported in this stand not only by Protestants but also by many of the Catholics who had personal experience with the bitter persecutions Hungarian Protestants had to endure from the hated rule of the court at Vienna and felt convinced that the hierarchy of the church was often only the tool of absolutism.[27] In his speeches in England and America Kossuth often repeated that "I am a Protestant not only by birth but by conviction. I am a humble member of a nation, the majority of which is composed of Catholics, and it is not the least glory to my nation that at all times we fought and bled for religion liberty—Catholics as devotedly as Protestants."[28]

The benefit of Kossuth's fight for religious liberty from a Protestant standpoint was brought home even to the humblest member of the Catholic Church in Hungary when Article XIII of the new Constitution abolished compulsory tithes to the clergy without compensation.

Kossuth was able to inspire an almost religious loyalty in his followers. A devoted friend who went with him into exile after the collapse of the War of Independence often referred to him privately as "our little god," using the term in a most serious sense. The earnest desire of his followers to keep him "unspotted" is well illustrated in the following story. In the immediate company of Kossuth when he emigrated to Turkey were Count and Countess Theodore Dembinski, Polish refugees. The count was an acute alcoholic and "his young, beautiful, and charming wife"[29] spent most of her time in Kossuth's company. The officers of Kossuth's suite, fearful of scandal, demanded that the countess be sent to Constantinople, and she was thus disposed of. Charles Laszlo wrote of this incident:

> Thus, finally, we were able to say that our beloved and respected—in reality worshiped—little god of our poor country was freed from that dangerous siren

27 Farkas, *op. cit.*, 109-114.
28 *New York Tribune*, Nov. 15, 1851.
29 Hajnal, *op. cit.*, I, 419.

who with her enticing beauty and sensuality was almost able to make him forget his poor wife who was hiding in Hungary and almost caused him to forget his duty toward his nation which worshiped him. She departed, being cordially hated by all of us who love our Kossuth and our nation.[30]

Even his enemies found it difficult to tear themselves away. Gabor Egressy, who deeply hated Kossuth, wrote in his diary: "What suggestive power lies in his supernaturally beautiful voice! Against his magic, like Ulysses, we have to tie ourselves to the mast so that unknowingly we do not run after him." Egressy, speaking of one of Kossuth's speeches delivered at the darkest hour of his Turkish exile, said: "The art of oratory never dazzled with so much force than in his speech which was able to lift into an almost touchable reality that which was only a mirage or nothing but unsubstantial air."[31]

The Rev. Charles Long Brace of Staten Island, N. Y., who visited Hungary in 1851, referred in his letters which were widely printed in the American papers to the admiration and worship that was accorded Kossuth by the people of Hungary. Telling about his impressions of Budapest, he wrote:

To say that Kossuth is beloved here seems hardly necessary after what I have seen. He is idolized. Every word and trait of his character is remembered with an indescribable affection. Even his faults are such as the people love when they blame. . . . He never could sign a death warrant, they say, through his whole administration. His appeals, like those of most of the greatest orators on record, were addressed exceedingly often to the religious feelings of the hearers.[32]

But Mr. Brace traveled in the remote villages of Hungary as well. In one letter he gave the following account of the peasantry's attitude toward Kossuth.

The poor creatures, some of them think he was inspired from Heaven, and they talk of him as if he were their prophet. They believe he is coming with the spring under the earth to free the land. Those who are more intelligent think he will come back from Asia with a host of their wild forefathers, the Huns. They pray for him in their houses and though his picture is forbidden, most of them have it concealed. He is almost worshipped.[33]

30 Charles Laszlo, Diary MS. Magyar Nemzeti Museum Szechenyi Konyvtar Oct. Hung. 720.

31 Hajnal, *op. cit.*, I, 425.

32 *New York Daily Tribune*, Sept. 20, 1851.

33 *Ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1851.

It has been recorded that in the midst of revolutionary fever several Masonic lodges were formed in Hungary dedicated to "Louis Kossuth, the dawn of illustrious light."[34] Mr. Brace, who himself was in an Austrian prison, told about Catholic priests, Protestant clergymen, and Jewish rabbis suffering together in these prisons for their active interest in the War of Independence.[35] How confident Kossuth was of the complete loyalty even of the lower Catholic clergy can be seen in the plans that were made under his direction by the people of General Makk for that ill-fated conspiracy in which an important place was offered to the Catholic clergy with this injunction: "The present pope agitated the people of Europe in 1848 and then betrayed them, . . . and thus deceived Christianity in its hopes. . . . Let them [the Hungarian Catholic clergy] break the power of the hierarchy—let there be a Hungarian pope."[36]

Unfortunately for Kossuth, the political police of the Bach ministry knew every move of this conspiracy even before Kossuth left Kutahia on Sept. 1, 1851, to collect the necessary funds for a new revolution, and it is almost certain that the pope was not left uninformed regarding these plans.[37] It was possible for this as well as other reasons that the Roman Catholic press in Europe and in America attacked him at every turn during his famous tour. However, one very important event took place at the outset of Kossuth's stay in Turkey that endeared him to many in the Christian world. It was his refusal to become a Mohammedan, even as a price for his life. Prince Radziwill, special agent of the czar, appeared in Constantinople with threatening demands for the extradition of the Polish and Hungarian revolutionary leaders. The Turkish Grand Council met on Sept. 8, 1849, and after heated debates the Resid government came to the conclusion that if the refugees would adopt the Mohammedan faith and thus become Turkish citizens, they would be protected against extradition. Julius Andrassy, Kossuth's agent at Constantinople, at once informed Kossuth and strongly recommended the acceptance of the offer as the only way out.

34 Balassa Jozsef, *Kossuth Amerikaban* (Budapest, Hungaria R. T., 1931), 56.

35 *New York Daily Tribune*, Aug. 8, 1851.

36 "Letter of Joseph Makk to the Hungarian Catholic Clergy," Constantinople, Sept. 14, 1851. XIX Century, Misc., O. L. Budapest, printed in *Documents of the History of the Emigration of 1848-1849*, No. 26 (Denes Janossy, ed.).

37 Janossy, *op. cit.*, I, 461.

The official news reached Kossuth at Widdin on Sept. 17, and on Sept. 19 Kossuth wrote the following letter to Lord Palmerston:

> As for myself, I could be very ready in answering. Placed between death and shame, the choice can be neither dubious nor difficult. As Governor of Hungary, chosen to the high place by the full confidence of 15,000,000 of my countrymen, I know very well what I owe to the honour of my nation even when an exile. Yes, even as a private individual. Though I have finished my political career, still I have open before me honour and honour's way. Once Governor of a generous country, I leave no heritage to my children. They shall at least have my unsullied name. I am ready to die. The will of God may be fulfilled. I am a man, my lord, ready to meet the worst. I can die with a free look toward heaven, as I have lived.[38]

Through the intervention of Sir Stratford Canning, England's envoy to Turkey, the English and French Mediterranean fleets paid a visit to the Dardanelles, thereby signifying that the West would not favor the extradition of the Hungarian and Polish refugee leaders. At that moment Kossuth was making a choice between being faithful to his Lutheran religion and going to the Austrian gallows, or renouncing his faith and saving his life. He made the choice of remaining a Lutheran without hesitation[39] and the Western world looked upon him as a hero of the faith. One New York religious newspaper wrote: "His letter to Lord Palmerston describing his wretched position and his heroic resolution to die rather than abjure Christianity is one of the most touching and splendid compositions in the English language. The spirit displayed by the noble Magyar on that occasion was the same that animated Latimer, Rogers, and Cranmer who were burnt at the stake for conscience' sake."[40]

It is true that toward the end of his American tour, in one of his speeches at Faneuil Hall in Boston, Kossuth himself was trying to minimize his heroic stand and to place the Turkish sultan and his government into a more favorable light,[41] but this was done simply because he was eager to get into the good graces of that government whose friendship he needed if he were to smuggle American arms into Hungary.

When on Sept. 10, 1851, Kossuth finally stepped on board the

38 Janossy, ed., *Documents of the History of the Emigration of 1848-1849,* No. 24.
39 Laszlo Karoly, *Naplotoredeket* (Budapest: Franklin Tarsulat, 1887), 8.
40 *The New York Evangelist,* Dec. 18, 1851.
41 *The Independent,* May 13, 1852.

United States warship "Mississippi" to begin his memorable journey to England and to America, his Protestant convictions and his heroic stand against conversion to Mohammedanism were known everywhere in the West. He was hailed both in England and in America as the hero of Christianity and as one of the most influential leaders of a militant Protestantism that was already hard at work through its missionaries in Catholic Europe to win the people from "Jesuitical rule."[42] One writer, signing himself as "Knox," declared in the Presbyterian Magazine:

> Two of the great dangers of Europe are the despotism of Russia and the despotism of Rome. . . . The Emperor of Austria is lame on both feet. He leans with one hand on Russia and with the other on Rome. . . . His reign is the reign of ultramontane Popery. His triumph in Hungary is the triumph of the Jesuits. With the constitutional liberty of that gallant nation the Protestant church stands or falls. . . . To our apprehension Europe must fall into the arms either of Jesuitism or atheistic socialism, unless rational Christian liberty can be established in Hungary. The cause of Hungary, therefore, is not merely the cause of civil liberty, but that of Protestantism and of evangelical religion.[43]

The anti-Catholic feeling of this militant Protestantism was heightened by the policy of the Austrian government toward the Protestant Churches in Hungary.

After the defeat of the Revolution, Baron Haynau, military dictator in Hungary, on Feb. 10, 1850, issued an edict whereby the Protestant Churches of Hungary were placed under virtual military supervision. Protestant schools were declared as "below-standard" institutions and thus discredited, church meetings were suspended, and all church administrative functions had to be carried out in the presence of an officer of the state. The news of the above edict was reported from Europe with the following comments: "Remember, ye in America, of whatever religion—ye who love free thought and who labor to spread free institutions, what it means to *Catholicize* Hungary! It means to crush and extinguish the last hope of a better future for that generous nation. It means, to introduce not the Catholicism of America, or France, or of

42 Quoted in Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), 255.

43 *The Independent,* March 11, 1852.

England, but the lying Jesuitry and the freedom-hating Catholicism of Vienna and Naples."[45] The Rev. J. P. Gulliver declared at a meeting of the American Home and Missionary Society: "Let the despots exult in their easy victory over the feeble, unenlightened, unevangelized nations of Europe! Their triumph will be short! The Spirit of the Lord shall ere long lift up the standard, and a voice, as the sound of many waters, shall proclaim to the world the truth, 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' "[46]

The Protestant world heard with horror such atrocities as appeared from the pen of Red Republican Emil Girardini in *La Presse* about republicans supposedly buried alive by blood-thirsty priests and about Roman wives and daughters prostituting themselves to obtain liberty for their husbands or fathers. "It is thus," warned Girardini, "that a government of priests tear the life of men whom they dare not destroy in public by the hand of an executioner."[47] The alarming growth of Catholicism through immigration,[48] the tactless and militant attitude of Archbishop John Hughes of New York,[49] and his official organ, the *New York Freemen's Journal and Catholic Register,* did not help matters either. In rejecting connection with a suggestion to petition the pope that he grant religious liberty in Rome, this paper responded with the following: "So the Pope does not thank anybody for what freedom Catholics enjoy in America. Catholic Bishops do not thank anybody. We thank nobody! We bless God for *His* good providence in the matter and *stand ready to pull the silly nose* of the first Methodist or Presbyterian who in act would attempt to prevent us in the free exercise of our religion."[50] British Protestants smarted under the so-called "Papal Aggression" of the 1850's, which they believed showed itself in the drift of the Oxford Movement toward the papacy[51] and also in the alleged persecution of English missionaries and Bible agents in Italy and Hungary.[52] Added to this was the anti-Catholic agitation of Mazzini, of whose activities Orestes Brownson, recently converted to Catholicism, said: "A great portion of this money for Mazzini's

45 *The Independent,* October 16, 1851.
46 *Ibid.,* May 20, 1852.
47 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Aug. 19, 1851.
48 *The Independent,* May 13, 1852.
49 Billington, *op. cit.,* 290.
50 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Oct. 23, 1851.
51 Billington, *op. cit.,* 263.
52 *The Independent,* Oct. 23, 1851.

propaganda comes from the British and Continental Protestants and atheists, from that indescribable horde which is united upon one thing only,—to hate the Pope and to leave no means untried to drive him from Rome. The Evangelical Societies, particularly, are very useful to Mazzini. . . .[53]

Kossuth's stand on the heated religious issues preceded him long before his arrival at Southampton on Oct. 23 and in New York on Dec. 4, 1851. Books, articles, and the sixpence pamphlet literature[54] gave ample opportunity for the general public to know his stand. Algernon Massingberd, who visited Kossuth at Kutahia, published his *Letter on Kossuth and the Hungarian Question* early in 1851 and here he told the British public that Kossuth's method of breaking the power of the pope would be the establishment of an Anglican bishopric in Rome.[55] Even the London *Times'* unfriendly attitude was explained by the influence of "Papal Aggression." One English correspondent wrote to America that the attacks of the *Times* on Kossuth were due to the fact that its "chief proprietor," Mr. Walter, was a graduate of Oxford University and a member of Exeter College, which was "penetrated by English popery, which is absolutism."[56]

Kossuth had no objection to being counted in the camp of this militant Protestantism since his public life in Hungary was intimately connected with the issues of Protestant religious liberty. His speeches which refer to this subject, however, show a desire to be known not so much as an anti-Catholic but rather as an anti-hierarchical and anti-Jesuitical person. He was sincerely conscious of how much he owed to his liberal Catholic friends in Hungary. In the general noise of the religious thunderbolts that flew so freely around him, his fine distinctions had no impression upon either of the hostile camps. Thus Kossuth stood before the English and American public as a hero of European Protestantism, a second "Peter the Hermit" coming out of his two years of isolation to lead the people of God on a holy crusade.[57] Kossuth was too good a politician not to accept this ready made setting

53 *Brownson's Quarterly Review,* N.S. VI (January, 1852), 105.

54 *The Life of Louis Kossuth from Authentic Sources with his Portrait written on the Occasion of his Arrival in England* (printed by E. Deutsh & Co., 1851).

55 Hentaller Lajos, *Kossuth es Kora* (Budapest: Athenaeum R. T., 1844), 279.

56 *The Independent,* Nov. 27, 1851.

57 H. A. Boardman, *The New Doctrine of Intervention* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1852), 35.

even though he felt uncomfortable at times under the criticism of Roman Catholic bishops. In his speech at Manchester, England, on Nov. 12, 1851, he frankly asked for the support of Protestant religious organizations.

I hope the cause will be supported by religious associations, as in Hungary freedom of conscience is put down by despotism. Even in these very days the Protestants of Hungary shut their schools because they were forced by government to surrender education or give it into the hands of the Austrian Jesuitical religious societies. I look also for the protection of the Reform Society, of the Free Trade Society, and of the Association of the Friends of Italy.[58]

When on November 18, at Eaton Square, London, a group of British ladies presented him with a German Bible and an "honorable working man" from Winchester presented his wife with one as well, he was glad to testify:

Being a religious man and because religion is as well an enemy to superstition, intolerance and fanaticism, as on the other hand the friend of freedom, I readily confess that it is from this great book that I have learned the principle of loving my neighbors as myself and strength and courage to act in the great cause which has always been the guide of my life.[59]

While the Evangelical and reform societies greeted Kossuth in England with the sentiments of Louis Blanc (the Luther of the modern age)[60] the Established Church of England took its key from the court of Queen Victoria, who was hostile toward Kossuth. At his departure for America an Anglican newspaper made the following observation:

Of course, Mr. Kossuth has found plenty of willing auditors in this country . . . and John Bull has a great taste for public meetings and long speeches, with Liberty for the text. . . . One of the most singular features of the Kossuth movement in this country has been the leading part taken in it by Mr. Bright, the Quaker, and Mr. Cobden, the apostle for the extinction of the naval and military forces of Great Britain. . . . Mr. Bright should resign either his Quaker profession or his alliance with Kossuth.[61]

58 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Nov. 25, 1851.
59 *Ibid.,* Nov. 24, 1851.
60 *London Daily News,* Nov. 6, 1851.
61 *The Christian Observer,* 1851, 865.

However, neither the cool criticism of the Established Church nor the hot Irish temper of the Dublin Catholic Press[62] was able to stem the tide of enthusiasm that greeted Kossuth in America. America noted Kossuth's reception in England. In his Thanksgiving Day sermon from his New York pulpit the Rev. Dr. Hatfield spoke of the significance of Kossuth's reception in England.

> What means it that the late prisoner of Kutahya, the branded exile, the fugitive from the Austrian vengeance, the noble Ludwig *Kossuth,* is drawing to himself the eyes and hearts of the world's freemen? Why these spontaneous outbreakings and demonstrations of the people—not the aristocracy, but the people—in our fatherland? Why is it that the British heart is moved as never before at the approach of a stranger? . . . It honors Kossuth as a large-hearted, generous, noble, faithful friend of man. It honors him . . . as a personification of Democratic principle in Continental Europe.[63]

Kossuth's fellow refugees who came on the "Mississippi" straight to the United States were promptly taken in hand by the New York clergy. On November 16 they attended Dr. Com's church on Brown Street in the morning, Henry Ward Beecher's Church at Brooklyn in the evening, and two days after they listened to a lecture given by the Rev. Daniel Noyes on Hungary before the Brooklyn Philomathean Society.[64] At the great Kossuth reception which was held by the City of New York on Saturday, December 6, 1851, a prominent place was given to the anti-Catholic American Protestant Association.[65] This organization was represented by three lodges with two large banners. The banners read:

> Where the Spirit of the Lord is
> There is liberty. God is our guide.
>
> The Protestant Association of the U. S. A. tenders
> to the illustrious Kossuth a hearty welcome
> to the Land of Freedom and Home of the Oppressed.[66]

62 "Another view of the Hungarian Question," in *The New York Daily Tribune,* Sept. 29, 1851.

63 *The New York Evangelist,* Jan. 8, 1852.

64 Billington, *op. cit.,* 438-439.

65 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 8, 1851.

66 *Ibid.,* Dec. 15, 1851.

The day after Kossuth's reception in New York the Rev. Sidney A. Corey, of the Baptist Church on 12th Street, preached a sermon on the "Coming of Kossuth" and repeated the sermon on the following Sunday. The text of the sermon was taken from Rev. 1:7, "Behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him. . . ." The enthusiastic pastor declared that "God had raised Cyrus to liberate the Jews and Kossuth to liberate the oppressed nations of Europe . . . and said that the coming of Kossuth was an illustration of the second coming of Christ. . . . He thought the present events were intended to precede the coming of Christ and that Kossuth was sent by God to prepare the way."[67] Several religious advertisements appeared regarding sermons on Kossuth. One announced:

> Kossuth! Rev. H. J. Eddy will deliver discourse on the theme "Kossuth, God's man for the times" in the Cannon St. Baptist Church—Sabbath 14th inst. at 3 o'clock P.M.[68]

Mr. Eddy must have been well pleased with the response, for the following Saturday three papers carried this advertisement:

> Kossuth again. Rev. Mr. Eddy will speak again on Dec. 21, 1851, on "Religious Bearings of the Hungarian Question," in spite of anonymous letters or Jesuitical threats. . . .[69]

The Rev. J. P. Thompson, pastor of the Tabernacle Church, published a pamphlet entitled *Christian Essentials of Liberty* and offered the profit to the Hungarian cause.[70] Dr. Bellow, who was experimenting with an interdenominational church in New York, said that "since Kossuth landed, he did not eat or drink or sleep without him, for Kossuth was constantly present in his dreams."[71] One unidentified pastor was so eager to hear Kossuth that when he was unable to purchase a ticket for the press banquet given in Kossuth's honor, he paid one of the waiters so that he might take his place.[72]

The Rev. Theodore Parker, "the stern iconoclast of Boston," who

67 *Ibid.*, Dec. 15, 1851.
68 *Ibid.*, Dec. 13, 1851.
69 *Ibid.*, Dec. 20, 1851.
70 *Ibid.*, Dec. 13, 1851.
71 *Ibid.*, Dec. 2, 1851.
72 Janossy, *op. cit.*

staunchly defended Kossuth from being classed with the "Doughfaces of Divinity,"[73] preached in his sermon:

Why is it that so much is heard in America against Kossuth? Is it because his presence is a reproach to us? What if such a man had come here in 1791? . . . How shall we receive him in 1851? In the place of John Hancock and Samuel Adams, let us have the Commissioners and Kidnappers of Boston to take him by the hand. . . .[74]

In Philadelphia the Rev. John Chambers, in the name of the Evangelical clergy, gave a stirring address[75] for which he was called the "Fourth of July Preacher" by Garrison because in an invocation he called upon Kossuth "to go forth like a Christian Mohamet with the sword in one hand and the Scriptures in the other."[76] The Rev. W. R. Furness, pastor of the First Congregational Unitarian Church of Philadelphia, delivered a sermon on January 4, 1852, in which he said:

But above all, who that has seen, who that has heard, this great Hungarian exile who has come to us bringing his unhappy country in his heart that does not feel his kindred [sic] to his oppressed brethren everywhere? I have looked into those large sad eyes, in which one seems to look into the great deep of a nation's sorrow. I have heard that voice, coming from his inmost soul, with which he pleaded for his dear native land and I cannot so much as to try to tell you of the profound impression which he made on me.[77]

In Albany, N. Y., the Rev. M. Palmer delivered a Kossuth sermon to a crowded house. "His tribute to Kossuth was admirable. Its repetition and publication are called for," said the report.[78] With abolitionist bitterness Conway remarked:

The Washington pulpits had not yet said anything about slavery at our doors, but it was easy to be enthusiastic for liberty as far away as Hungary, and so the preachers all paid homage to Kossuth.[79]

73 *The Liberator,* March 12, 1852.
74 *Ibid.,* Dec. 5, 1852.
75 *The Independent,* Jan. 1, 1852.
76 *The Liberator,* Jan. 9, 1852.
77 *Ibid.,* Jan. 23, 1852.
78 *The Independent,* Jan. 22, 1852.
79 Moncure Daniel Conway, *Autobiography, Memories and Experiences* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904), II, 110.

The Rev. William L. McCalla, of Philadelphia, said that Kossuth, this "Lutheran republican whom God has sent among us to arouse us from our lethargy and whose very visit was occasioned by the combined efforts of absolutism and Romanism to extinguish liberty and the Bible, has emancipated more serfs than the whole population of the Southern States."[80]

Kossuth's most devoted friend among the ministers in America was Henry Ward Beecher, pastor of the fashionable Plymouth Congregational Church of Brooklyn. On December 16, 1851, Dr. Beecher arranged for the most successful church affair held in Kossuth's behalf in America, collecting over $8,000 during this single night for the Kossuth Fund.[81] He was not a new "convert" to the Hungarian cause, for on the above occasion he said to his congregation: "Bear witness to me how often from this place your prayers have been offered and your tears shed when we heard of the struggles in Europe. . . . We did not forget him [Kossuth] in his captivity. We prayed for him and his noble land."[82] Dr. Beecher's house was open to the refugees from Hungary on many occasions. Colonel Pertzel, Kossuth's chief of staff, and his wife stopped with him for several weeks.[83] Kossuth's private secretary, Charles Laszlo, remembers him with a great deal of affection as one who understood the yearning of the lonely refugees and invited them to his intimate family table.[84]

His own co-religionists, the Lutherans, were no less eager if somewhat less demonstrative to greet him. The Rev. F. W. Geissenheimer, pastor of the Lutheran Church at 15th Street and Avenue C in New York, expressed the opinion at a minister's meeting that "he considered Kossuth a religious man, a man who puts his trust in the Lord, and an orthodox man who believes in the Bible." He was also hoping that the ministry in Germany would take heart from the example of the American Lutherans and endorse the democratic principles represented by Kossuth.[85] On December 11, 1851, ministers of Greater New York visited Kossuth at the Irving House, inviting him and

80 B. Laurence Bevilagna-Horvath, *America and Kossuth's Hungary* (Washington: Ideal Printing Co., 1948), 5.

81 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 16, 1851.

82 *Ibid.,* Dec. 19, 1851.

83 William C. Beecher and S. Scoville, *A Biography of the Rev. H. W. Beecher* (New York: Charles L. Webster & Co., 1888), 352.

84 Laszlo, *op. cit.,* 135.

85 *Ibid.,* Dec. 13, 1851; Dec. 22, 1851.

sending a carriage for him to attend St. Matthew's Lutheran Church at 79th and Walker Streets. On December 21, 1851, Kossuth attended the church, where the sermon was preached in German and the pastor invoked God's blessing on Kossuth.[86]

On Christmas night, in Philadelphia, Kossuth was in bed with a bad cold. The visit of twenty leading Lutherans of the city at the time touched him deeply, and he discussed briefly with them the message of the Christmas angel.[87] At Harrisburg several deputations of Lutheran ministers brought him greetings and material aid[88] from Reading and Hollidaysburg. On January 18 Kossuth was snowbound in Hollidaysburg. "The next day being Sunday," wrote Laszlo, "with Kossuth we went to the Lutheran Church at Hollidaysburg, where the pastor instead of giving a Gospel message, gave a political oration, speaking with real enthusiasm for Kossuth and the Hungarian cause."[89] Kossuth met the Rev. W. Passavant in Pittsburgh, who gave the invocation at the large Kossuth meeting in the Masonic Hall of that city.[90] The Pulszkys, who were Kossuth's companions on the American tour, managed to take time to see Passavant's famous institution of mercy before leaving the city.[91]

Enthusiasm, especially in the Middle West, reached a revivalistic frenzy. Laszlo wrote in his *Diary* with distaste: "Many religious fanatics listen to Kossuth with holy ecstasy and confess him to be a prophet of God.[92] Religious poems of dubious value appeared in many church periodicals. One poem of seventeen verses by a person calling himself "The Work-Shop Bard" made Kossuth thunder forth against the Turks.

> Curses upon the lip
> That to me shall dare propose
> Bartered faith or fellowship
> With Messiah's haughty foes.
> Israel's God shall still be mine—
> By his altar we shall stand,
> Trusting in his power divine
> To uphold us with his hand.[93]

86 *The New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 16, 1851.
87 Janossy, *op. cit.,* I, 250.
88 *Pittsburgh Gazette,* Jan. 24, 1852.
89 Laszlo, *op. cit.,* 165.
90 *Daily Morning Post* (Pittsburgh, Pa.), Jan. 27, 1852.
91 Pulszky, *White Red Black,* I, 102.
92 Laszlo, *op. cit.,* 196.
93 *The Independent,* Oct. 23, 1852.

A special "choir song" was written for the occasion and rendered by the church choir in the Second Presbyterian Church at Pittsburgh, and when Kossuth and his wife walked down the aisle of the church, the choir sang:

> Our hearts beat warm for thee,
> Thy name will shrine in memory's vase
> With all things bright and free.[94]

The wife of a minister of Xenia, Ohio, wrote to Kossuth that she had neither gold nor silver to give him but was willing to let her son go and fight for Kossuth's Hungary, and that she was going to teach her eleven-month-old grandson, Kossuth Harmon, to worship God and liberty.[95] An incident at Newburg, Ohio, was expressive of the religious zeal and personal worship accorded to Kossuth.

> A young man was seen pushing through the crowd, shouting "Eljen Kossuth! Eljen Kossuth!" Soon he reached the car. "God bless you Kossuth," said he, "God bless you. You are a political Christ." "Say not that," said the Magyar, putting both his hands on his head and blessing him. "He is a Holy One, but for freedom I am willing now, in humble imitation of Him, to bear the cross and die on it for Freedom." The young man wept.[96]

A similar incident occurred when Kossuth entered the Melodeon at Cleveland, Ohio, on February 2, 1852, to give his principal address. When Mayor Case introduced Kossuth, someone in the audience shouted "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord." (Great cheering.)[97] Even calm New Englanders asked with enthusiasm: "Can any son of the Pilgrims have read the speeches of that extraordinary man and not have felt their coincidence with the principles propounded, vindicated, and established in church and state by our fathers?"[98] It is little wonder, therefore, that William Lloyd Garrison, the pacifist who tried desperately to stop the Kossuth frenzy, cried out in disgust:

> What infatuation! *This religion* in the middle of the 19th century in republican Christian Protestant America. *So this* and the advertisement of George Law in the

94 *True Democrat* (Cleveland daily), Feb. 2, 1852.
95 *New York Times,* Feb. 14, 1852.
96 *True Democrat* (Cleveland daily), Feb. 2, 1852.
97 *Daily Herald* (Cleveland, Ohio), Feb. 3, 1852.
98 *The Independent,* March 25, 1852.

Baptist of the 18th of March are some of the "first fruits" of Kossuth's mission? The clergy of a large city, Cincinnati, Ohio, assembled at a hotel—ambassadors from the court of heaven . . . to hear one who is training this nation to deeds of blood.[99]

One minister also spoke with alarm at the meeting of the Tract Society in New York: "I censure not others, but speak chiefly of my own peril—that we shall be drawn to *preaching Kossuth instead of Christ!* Our people, too, are in danger."[100]

The greater the Kossuth enthusiasm grew among the Protestants of America, the more desperate became the effort of the Roman Catholic clergy and press to discredit the man. Johann Hulsemann, the *charge d' affairs* of the Austrian government in Washington, had personal as well as official reasons to discredit Kossuth before the churches. Hulsemann had a rather shady reputation at Vienna, not only because he was considered as an adventurer but also because it was generally believed at court that he left his former religion and embraced Catholicism to get ahead in the service of the Catholic emperor.[101] The secret diplomatic correspondence at Vienna, according to Janossy, conclusively proves that it was Hulsemann who collected all the material used in the anti-Kossuth press of America.[102]

The attack on Kossuth by the Roman Catholics was opened by the militant archbishop of the New York Diocese, John Hughes, who won Irish sympathy when he said that Kossuth "was free . . . to speak against the pope or Jesuits, but it was not in good taste, nor was it quite appropriate to call the government that had so long oppressed Ireland a paradise, forsooth."[103] This line of attack was well chosen, for soon letters appeared in the daily papers from Irishmen who asked what the Hungarians would say if an Irishman traveling in Austria would praise that government which oppressed them.[104] Archbishop Hughes stayed on this line of attack, except for calling Kossuth a "humbug" and making the cutting remark that at one time he was not sure that Kossuth "did not compose Revolutionary Litanies, invoking the aid of the Blessed Virgin Mary and all the Saints."[105]

99 *The Liberator,* May 14, 1852.
100 *The New York Evangelist,* Dec. 25, 1851.
101 Janossy, *op. cit.,* I, 155.
102 *Ibid.,* 177.
103 *New York Daily Tribune,* Nov. 18, 1851.
104 *Ibid.,* Dec. 13, 1851.
105 *The Independent,* Dec. 4, 1851.

Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburgh made a more detailed indictment. His objection was on three grounds: first, that Kossuth made common cause with European socialists and red republicans; second, that Kossuth praised England, a country which oppressed Roman Catholics; third, that his agitation for American intervention in Europe was very dangerous to the welfare of the United States.[106]

Less cautious were the statements of some other Catholic antagonists of Kossuth. The Rev. Mr. Roddan, in a lecture before the Catholic Institute of Williamsburg, said in connection with Kossuth:

> Whoever then may belong to Protestantism, a woman at all events should not. She should not be a revolutionist nor a socialist and when she hears her brother or her husband shout for Kossuth and see him throw up his cap for the liberty for which he strives, she should utter a holy warning in his ear, for of that liberty the degradation of womanhood will be, must be, an inevitable result.[107]

The American and Foreign Church Union commented regarding an article supposedly published in the *Shepherd of the Valley,* a Roman Catholic paper in St. Louis, warning the faithful of the evil influences of Kossuth. The article was closed with the injunction: "Let Catholics look to it, there is a spirit abroad, an evil spirit, with which no Christian can safely deal. The Catholic has no mission to propagate democracy. . . ."[108]

The Catholic opposition to Kossuth was most ably represented by Orestes August Brownson, a former Unitarian minister who, in 1844, had become a Roman Catholic. Brownson even went on a lecture tour to propagate his anti-Kossuth views.[109] His main line of attack was endeavoring to show that the Hungarian war was a "war of races." From the religious angle he was trying to prove that the "Hungarian rebels were Protestant Magyars, Poles, and Jews."[110] He further stated that only those people are willing to help Kossuth's plans "to whom a revolution in Catholic countries is desirable no matter by whom."[111]

It is interesting to note that there was no unanimity in Catholic circles on the Kossuth controversy. One of the Hungarian refugees

106 *The Daily Commercial Journal* (Pittsburgh, Pa.), Jan. 30, 1852.
107 *The Independent,* March 11, 1852.
108 *Ibid.,* March 18, 1852.
109 *New York Herald,* Feb. 19, 1852.
110 *Brownson's Quarterly Review,* V, N. S., 515.
111 *Ibid.,* VI, N. S., 98.

wrote that "the Jesuits and the Roman Catholic bishops are very angry since not even the fanatical Irish are willing to heed their pulpit thunders."[112] The two Roman Catholic members of the Senate, Shields of Indiana and Mallory of Florida, voted for the resolution to receive Kossuth at the Capitol.[113] E. Lewis Lowe, governor of Maryland, himself a Roman Catholic, wrote to Kossuth: "I am quite satisfied that the great bulk of Catholics of the United States (certainly of Maryland) most heartily sympathize with your unfortunate country in its sore tribulation."[114]

Kossuth was trying to overcome adverse Catholic sentiment by praising the Irish and their love of liberty, as he did in his speech at the Melodeon in Cleveland, Ohio.[115] But when certain Jesuits attacked him, he spoke out against them, for in these he thought that he saw the inspiration of Austria. He said:

It is indeed a strange striking fact to see these reverend fathers here in a republic so warmly advocating the cause of despotism. . . . I hold here in my hand the printed catalogue of the Society of Jesus in the Province of Missouri, as they term your state. Here I see that among the thirty-five members officiating in the college of the Father Jesuits, in St. Louis, there are not less than *eight* Reverend Father Jesuits imported from Austria. Now you see why I am so persecuted here. This plain fact tells the story of a big book.[116]

The fact remains, however, that in spite of the Jesuits and the Catholic bishops, Kossuth made a profound impression on American church people of all faiths. His spiritual earnestness impressed friend and foe alike. A representative of Congress wrote to his wife from Washington on January 1, 1852:

His arguments are so strong that there is hardly mortal man who could attempt to disprove them, since he bases his arguments on the highest ethical principles which were taught by Christ himself. Do not think that I am favoring him. No, not for the world! As a representative of Congress, I am standing rigidly on non-intervention, but as a private citizen, I have the right to feel and talk as my conscience dictates. Never in my life have I seen any man whose voice, words, glances,

112 Aldor Imre, *Vazletok a Magyar Emigracio Eletebol* (Pest, 1870), 163.
113 *The Independent,* Dec. 25, 1851.
114 Annapolis, Md., March 20, 1852, in Janossy, ed., *Documents,* No. 393.
115 *True Democrat* (Cleveland daily), Feb. 3, 1852.
116 *The Independent,* April 8, 1852.

so impressed me and filled me with such respect for the person's spiritual greatness and goodness.[117]

Kossuth made friends with the conservative Christian elements of America, for he was the first outstanding European revolutionary who was respectful of the church. His speeches were filled with allusions pleading to his friends in the churches. At the municipal dinner in New York on December 11, 1851, he said, "I may displease you perhaps, still I will say with Luther, 'May God help me—I can do no otherwise!' "[118] In reply to an address by some clergymen, he declared, "There is no country on the earth more religious than this. I mention it as a fact that the freest people are also the most religious."[119] In his first Cleveland speech he used this imagery:

> The Almighty often wrote the fate of nations into the mountains or winding rivers. Do you think that the majestic chain of your Great Lakes, leading to the Atlantic Ocean, is only a play of Nature? No, not at all! They are God's greatest fingers pointing at the Ocean as the inevitable fact that you are tied to old Europe. Do not forget the finger of God, before the delay could cause unreparable damage.[120]

The legislature of Ohio was deeply impressed with this religious picture: "My country is now a Golgotha, where my Nation is crucified. But the cross is not a symbol of death but of resurrection."[121] One of his most happy and oft quoted statements was the one given on the spur of the moment to a group of workmen from the American Bible Society who presented him with a Bible. The speaker said that they intended to bring him "more substantial gifts" at a later date, to which Kossuth at once responded that nothing could be more substantial than the Holy Bible.[122] At the Congressional banquet in Washington, D. C., he said, referring to Hungary's stand against the Turks, "We guarded Christendom that Luther and Calvin might reform it."[123]

It is little wonder, therefore, that the Rev. H. A. Boardman, of

117 Balint Barothy, *Ismeretlen Levelek Kossuth Amerikai Szerepleseorp* (Budapest: Olasz Jeno Kiadasa, 1925), 56.

118 *New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 12, 1851.

119 *The New York Evangelist,* Dec. 25, 1851.

120 Kossuth's MS Speech, Cleveland, Feb. 1, 1852, KH. OL. Budapest, in Janossy, *op. cit.,* I, 311.

121 *Weekly Ohio Statesman* (Columbus), Feb. 10, 1852.

122 *New York Daily Tribune,* Dec. 18, 1851.

123 *The Independent,* Jan. 15, 1852.

Philadelphia, could say, "He stood before the nation as a Christian who, before whatever audiences, proclaimed, with a frankness too rare in our statesmen, his attachment to the Bible."[124] This loyalty of Kossuth was not left unrewarded. E. D. Phelps, Esq., of New York City, paid the customary fee of $150 into the treasury of the American Bible Society, which organization then promptly elected Kossuth as a "life director."[125]

Enthusiasm of the American church people ran so high that they even provided for the establishment of a Hungarian congregation in New York City and Newark, N. J. The Rev. Gedeon Acs, one of the most colorful members of Kossuth's suite, who began his career by preaching revolutionary sermons in Hungary[126] and who ministered to Kossuth and his fellows in Turkish exile, was called upon to establish the congregation. The first service was held in the lecture room of the North Dutch Church on Fulton Street. Henry Ward Beecher reported the following to the papers:

> Quite a number of men present, although the notice has been limited. The Rev. Gedeon Acs (pronounced Atch) is the pastor. Although many of the gentlemen of the Hungarian Board are Roman Catholics in their religious education, yet they will worship together without distinction of sects, according to the Hungarian Calvinistic order of worship. One of them said to the writer, "We shall form a Hungarian congregation."[127]

The Christian Intelligencer also reported on the interfaith experiment of the Hungarians.

> Among the audience were Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Greeks as well as those of the Reformed Church, also, one formerly a Roman Catholic priest, now converted to the Protestant faith. . . . Much emotion was felt at the singular coincidence, that the first time divine service was ever held in the Hungarian language in America, was the anniversary of the commencement of the Revolution in Hungary.[128]

Indeed, as Acs reported in his very interesting "Diary," the first service was held on March 14 between 10 A.M. and 12 M. Acs received four

124 Boardman, *op. cit.*, 7.

125 *New York Daily Tribune*, Dec. 27, 1851.

126 Frank Preston Stearns, *The Life and Public Service of George Luther Stearns* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1907), 103.

127 *The Independent*, March 18, 1852.

128 *Ibid.*, April 22, 1851.

hundred dollars per year, but he did not hold on to the position for more than two years because some of the Hungarians told him that they came to church only because they did not want him to lose his job, and some even expressed the opinion that it was his duty to marry one of the "supporting misses."[129] Acs reported that his most faithful church members were the Jewish Hungarians who liked his Unitarian doctrines.[130] As the experiment with the New York Hungarian Church suggests, the members of Kossuth's party were not the pious and militant Calvinists that they appeared to be in the press of Protestant America. Francis Pulszky was the only one outside of Kossuth himself who spoke with respect of American Protestantism.

Pulszky, Kossuth, and their wives were very much interested in welfare and social institutions in America and never missed an opportunity to visit such institutions. While with Kossuth and Governor Wright of Indiana, who were visiting a Methodist Church service, Pulszky remarked "no glittering formalities, no working on the imagination, not much reasoning, but powerful accent and appeals to the conscience, with continuous reference to the Scriptures, interwoven with frequent warnings pointing to heaven and hell. The audience seemed deeply moved, they sang unmusically, but prayed earnestly. I could not doubt the deep religious conviction of the people."[131] Kossuth's private secretary, Charles Laszlo, in the unpublished portions of his Diary, spoke his mind freely on the subject of American religions. He gave the following most interesting description of a Methodist Episcopal camp meeting near Syracuse, N. Y.

When I arrived it was eleven o'clock in the morning and the service was over. The believers sat either before their open tents or inside the tent lying on hay. They were singing, praying, or preaching. When someone got the urge or, as they say, felt salvation coming on, he stood up and without any connection and order spoke all sorts of nonsense, whatever came to his tongue. Or, if he wanted to pray, he knelt before his stool, placed his head on it, or simply lifted his head toward the heavens, but closed his eyes, as if he were looking for Christ, first very quietly and always with greater vehemence. Finally, with a terrible yelling voice he said his extemporaneous prayer, which was made even more horrible by the encouraging yells of the others who kept on saying "Amen," "Oh Jesus," "Glory to God,"

129 Acs Tivadar, *Kossuth Papja: Acs Gedeon* (Vac. Kapisatran Hyomda), 77 ff.

130 *Ibid.*

131 Francis and Theresia Pulszky, *White Red Black* (London: Trubner and Co., 1853), II, 151.

etc. Since in every tent this identical thing happens at the same time, it is something awful to hear the dissonance of songs, prayers and yells together. But they think, or at least they say when they get home, that even the birds love their singing, where in reality even a donkey could get mad at such wild voices. . . . Well, if God finds pleasure in such worship, he must have very bad taste.[132]

Laszlo also described in great detail an anti-Catholic lecture held by a certain Mr. Perry, whose dramatic pictures and verbal illustrations of Catholic "idolatry" Laszlo did not approve.[133] Gedeon Acs was also defender of the Roman Catholics against oppression on the ground that such action "gives a great service to the Catholic priesthood." "Without this," wrote Acs, "in a free country like this, the Roman hierarchy could not exist for more than ten years."[134]

Most impressive were Kossuth's statements on international morality. For these statements Kossuth prepared himself in Kutahia, Turkey, where he made an extensive study of the sermons of Channing, who so eloquently pleaded for American help to the French Republic.[135] At Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, he said:

I am fully convinced that the next detonation of Europe has to bring about a new reformation in Christianity—not in respect to doctrine, but in respect of the great principles of Christianity which teach us to love our neighbors as we love ourselves.[136]

Developing this same idea before a delegation of Philadelphia clergymen, he connected the cause of Hungary with the above, when he said: ". . . therefore I believe that we, in Hungary and Europe, are now about to struggle not only for the principles of political and civic freedom, not only for religious liberty, but also to struggle indeed for the triumph of Christianity."[137] It was this thought that endeared Kossuth to the heart of the American Protestant clergy. It is no wonder that we still have two churches in America which were named in honor of Louis Kossuth. One of these is in Mediapolis, Iowa, and

132 Charles Laszlo, Diary *MS*, M. N. M. Szechenyi Konyvtar, 720, Vol. II, 62.
133 *Ibid.*, VIII, 77-81.
134 Gedeon Acs, "Boston Diary," *MS*, M. N. M. Szechenyi kot. quart. Hung. 2340, VI, 16 f.
135 Eugene N. Curtis, "American Opinion of the French Nineteenth Century Revolutions," *American Historical Review*, XXIX, 249 ff.
136 *The New York Evangelist*, Dec. 25, 1851.
137 *The Independent*, Jan. 1, 1852.

is a Presbyterian church, and the other is a Baptist church near Manitowoc, Wis.[138]

One American minister, speaking in the name of the Brooklyn Presbytery, expressed his idea of the reasons for Kossuth's popularity:

> Your known appreciation of the truth of God, your philosophy and eloquence, your ethics, your politics, your jurisprudence, so pervaded by it, and so based on it, these, Sir, in our view . . . associate you necessarily with our own *Washington*, and make you, before all nations at this day, the proper impersonation and the living symbol of *that great cause, the only one, which must finally prevail.*[139]

Kossuth sincerely believed—even to the very end of his long life—that Christian morality was the true foundation of international justice. His last speech in the United States was a confession of this faith. "I certainly have an unwavering faith in the destinies of Humanity, and though the mournful example of so many fallen nations instruct us that neither the diffusion of knowledge, nor the progress of industry, neither prosperity, nor power, nay, not even freedom itself can secure a future to nations, still I say there is one thing which can secure it . . . and that . . . is the law proclaimed by our Saviour, that rock is the unperverted religion of Christ."[140] In this almost final sentence of Kossuth in America, lay his religious message and appeal to the churches.

138 Vasvary Odon, "A Vallasos Kossuth," *Magyarsag* (Pittsburgh weekly), June 16, 1948.
139 *The New York Evangelist*, Dec. 18, 1851.
140 Louis Kossuth, *The Future of Nations* (New York: Fowlers-Wells, 1852), 27.

Notes and Studies

RESISTANCE TO AUTHORITY AND LUTHER

By Lowell C. Green

THE CONTROVERSY over the right to resist authority has become one of the most persistent of ethical problems confronting the church and society. It raises the question, What is true authority? Sin is resistance against the majesty of God. According to Romans 13:1 and the Fourth Commandment, resistance to the powers that be is resistance to powers ordained by God. Must we therefore draw the conclusion that resistance to earthly authorities is always rebellion against the majesty of God? Or, in other words, is resistance always sin?

There is a traditional school of thought, for centuries associated with the name of Luther, that would answer this question with an unhesitating "Yes!" But if we should readdress the question to unprompted thinking in America today, the traditional answer in all probability would be rejected. The attempt to solve this dilemma involves a brief glance at the current situation and a restudy of the traditional approach (especially in its relation to the stand actually taken by Luther) before any conclusions can be reached.

I

The authority of home and family must be the foundation of every discussion of rightful authority and the duty to obey it. This is basic to society.[1] However, authority today is being challenged on every hand. The demand of so-called progressive education, that the child be allowed uninhibited freedom in his personal and social development, works against the Christian interpretation of the Fourth Commandment. In contrast, the Bible emphasizes the value of teaching obedience and conformity. A challenge to the authority of the home is also found in the gradual usurpation of its functions by a state with totalitarian leanings. The threat, so apparent in the former *Hitlerjugend* and in the *Freie-Demokratische-Jugend* of present eastern Germany, is more subtly discernible in American life today—when, for instance, functions of the government and the public school system interfere seriously with the carrying on of a normal program in home and church.

1 Luther asserted that the authority of the state is derived from that of the home, which is prior to it. See Large Catechism, Fourth Commandment, 141 f., 150 f. Cf. *Martin Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus, 1889 ff.), hereafter cited as WA., *Tischreden* (1912 ff.), hereafter cited as TR., 1, No. 386. Luther at times referred to not only the two *Regimente* or orders of society, but spoke of a third as well, viz., the home. See Thesis 52 in the *Zirkulardisputation* of 1539: "Tres enim hierarchias ordinavit Deus contra diabolum, scilicet oeconomiam, politiam et Ecclesiam." WA. 39, II, 42.

Such a weakening of the authority of the home can lead only to a corresponding undermining of the authority of the state. It is only to be expected that where children have not learned to respect the authority of their parents, they will not regard the authority of the state. Resistance against the government includes crime and delinquency, a major sociological problem in America today. Crime has left the underworld and invaded the highest circles of government itself, revealing shocking examples of political dishonesty and fraud. Bribes ranging from mink coats and deep-freezers to cold cash have involved the government in manifold transgressions of its own laws. What bearing does this have on the relation of the Christian citizen to his state and its laws, and how does that affect his right to resist?

The question concerning the right to resist one's superiors has recently presented itself in an acute form in the field of management and labor relations. Regardless of how much sympathy one may have for the problems of the laborer, the fact cannot be overlooked that the labor strike is resistance to authority. The elimination of the old terms, "master" and "servant," has not altered this fact. When a labor union stages a strike in defiance of the government, as was done in the recent steel and railroad strikes where laborers denied the request of the government that they return to their posts in the interest of the defense effort, the relationship of the management and labor problem to the topic of this article becomes more apparent.

During the years of the *Kirchenkampf,* and today in the struggles of the church in the East Zone of Germany, the problem of resistance has achieved an ever deeper meaning.

While individual solutions for the problems outlined above will not be given here, a few suggestions along general lines will suggest answers to many particular questions. In every case the underlying problem is this: to what extent is the Christian bound to obey the powers that be, and when, if at all, may he with a good conscience offer resistance? It is especially necessary that the Lutheran Church find an answer to this question inasmuch as many attacks have in recent years been directed against Martin Luther and Lutheranism. At the same time, light will be cast upon the general problem confronting us.

II

Before proceeding to the subject, it will be necessary to refer briefly to past attempts to interpret Luther's position on the question of the right to resist authorities. The older approach of Lutherans was unfortunately often pervaded as much by political expediencies of the moment as by an objective analysis of what Luther had actually said and written. One can isolate three points that have become known as the characteristic "Lutheran" political doctrine. First, it has been held that Luther advocated an authoritarian state with unlimited powers in which the church was to be subservient. The principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* was inaccurately if unconsciously associated with Luther's name. Writers such as

Ernst Troeltsch asserted that the Lutheran faith was so tender that unlike the more robust Calvinism it could not survive without a paternalistic state.[2] Gerhard Ritter, writing in a more sympathetic vein, admitted that the Lutheran Church in Germany had leaned on the state too much in the past. Unlike Troeltsch, Ritter did not attempt to interpret this tendency as a legitimate heritage from Luther.[3]

Second, it has been taken for granted that Luther, after having established the absolutism of the state, had taught unconditional obedience to the powers that be. Third, it has been asserted that Luther permitted a limited *passive* resistance to the government in cases involving conscience, but in no case *active* resistance.

Such a political ethic proved untenable. For one thing, a tension arose between Romans 13:1 and Acts 5:29. Moreover, the view led to a false dualism of the Christian in his relation to church and state. The Christian tended to invest the doctrine of the two swords with almost gnostic implications. The church was considered God's representative, and the state the representative of ungodly forces.[4] In America this attitude was surely in part responsible for the tendency of the Lutheran laity to recoil from active participation in political life. It was in reaction against such a concept of political ethics that the polemics against Lutheranism during the past two decades were aimed by writers such as Karl Barth, William Inge, Thomas Mann, and Louis Mumford. The assertion was often repeated that Lutheranism had failed to provide an adequate doctrine of the state, and that the tragic road to Hitler had been prepared by Luther himself.

From such charges the post-war Lutheran Church in Germany and elsewhere has suffered a severe loss in prestige. Much study has been devoted to the problem by European theologians in recent years, including such men as Werner Elert, Helmut Thielecke, Walter Künneth, and Gustaf Törnvall. The paper by Eivind Berggrav, "State and Church—the Lutheran View,"[5] showed the world that the recent polemics against Lutheranism had in many cases been completely unfair. The article by Arna Fjellbu, "Luther as a Resource of Arms in the Fight for Democracy,"[6] gave a heart-warming story of the brave struggle of the Church

2 Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen, 1912), 513. Troeltsch seemed naively unaware that the Lutheran Church exists in other countries than Germany, or that it flourishes as a free church in nearly every corner of the globe.

3 Gerhard Ritter, "Luthertum, katholisches und humanistisches Weltbild," in *Zeitwende Monatsschrift* (München, 1946-1947), XVIII, 2, 83. The charge that Luther truckled before worldly authorities is without foundation and can be refuted by reading almost any of the treatises or letters that Luther ever wrote on political subjects.

4 For a thorough study of the two orders see Gustaf Törnvall, *Geistliches und weltliches Regiment bei Luther*, translated into German from the Swedish by Karl-Heinz Becker (München, 1947).

5 Translated and reprinted in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, IV, 4, 363-376. Berggrav's scholarship, here as in his book, *Man and State*, has been widely criticized. The idea of demonic government stems from Barth, not Luther. But Berggrav remains a hero for his staunch confession of the faith in difficult times.

6 In *World Lutheranism of Today: A Tribute to Anders Nygren* (Rock Island: Augustana, 1950), 81-97. Although the scholarliness of the article has been questioned—one ought not to attempt to "prove" a modern form of government on the basis of Luther—the work itself is a historical document of the first magnitude.

of Norway during the years of the Nazi occupation. At the same time the book by Hanns Lilje, fortunately translated into English and published under the title, *The Valley of the Shadow,* has proved the thesis that the much-berated German church offered staunch resistance, amid seemingly overwhelming opposition, against the evils of the Third Reich. This must be made clear over against the statements of churchly slanderers writing from their comparatively comfortable situations in Switzerland, England, or America. If the summons of Karl Barth is followed—that the Lutheran Church either come to a new, critical relationship to Luther or, if still possible, to another and better understanding of his teachings[7]—it will be found that many of the accusations made by Barth and others will have been refuted, and that the insinuation that Lutheranism has no relevance to the political and social situations of the present moment has no foundation in fact.

III

As pointed out earlier, for Luther the basic form of authority was the *hierarchia oeconomia* or the home.[8] Especially in his explanation of the Fourth Commandment in the Large Catechism, Luther stressed that the authority of the other orders is derived from that of parents,[9] and that further authority is merely an extension of the principle of fatherhood into other areas of life.[10] However, spiritual authority could not be applied to all in ecclesiastical power, Luther held, "for only those who govern us by God's Word are called spiritual fathers."[11] Luther recognized the divine institution of authority. In his lectures on Romans in 1515-1516 Luther developed especially the first verse of Romans 13, "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God," asserting that it means just that, that all authority has been ordained by God.[12] Indeed, the very fact that a given authority could exist and flourish at all was a proof that it existed and flourished because God had ordained it so. Hence the government must be obeyed.[13]

Luther's position regarding the right to resist government must be seen as a gradual development falling into at least two distinct periods of his life. The turning-point for Luther came early in the 1530's. Up to this time the success of

7 Quoted by Becker in Törnvall, *op. cit.,* 5.

8 WA. 39, II, 42.

9 "Denn aus der Eltern Oberkeit fleusset und breitet sich aus alle andere," Large Catechism, I, 141.

10 *Op. cit.,* I, 150.

11 *Op. cit.,* I, 158.

12 For a staunch reaffirming of Luther's interpretation of Rom. 13:1, see Werner Elert, "Paulus und Nero," in *Zwischen Gnade und Ungnade* (München, 1948), 38-71.

13 "Nulla enim potestas est inordinata . . . Igitur sic melius: 'Que autem sunt potestates, a Deo ordinate sunt, i.e. quia potestates sunt, ordinata sunt eiusmodi a Deo solo . . . ideo quecunque sunt et vigent Deo ordinante sunt ac vigent." WA. 56, 124-125. That this, Luther's reasoning in 1515-1516, is not conclusive, is apparent if one remembers that in the same way it could be proved that evil is ordained of God, merely because evil also remains and flourishes in the world.

the Reformation had been threatened from time to time by the menace of impending revolution. Two revolutions, the Wittenberg disturbances of 1521-1522 and the peasants' revolt of 1525, had been great misfortunes for the evangelical cause. During this period Luther had written many pamphlets, books, and letters condemning revolution as a means of overcoming tyranny. But when, later on, the threat became clear that the Reformation itself could be ruthlessly uprooted by the tyrant's sword, the Reformer was forced to take a broader view. Many attempts to understand Luther's political ethics have failed because of the common but arbitrary method of limiting investigation to the "Young Luther." Attempts to impute to the Reformer a doctrine of unconditional submission to the state succeeded in some instances because Luther's later writings were not consulted at all. The campaign against such methods, begun during the lifetime of Wilhelm Walther, of Rostock, exposed the unscholarliness of confining oneself to the early writings of Luther.

Thus in Luther's early period we find stern warnings against resistance as early as the lectures on Romans, 1515-1516. A decade later, Luther reinforced his earlier argument in his booklet, "Whether Soldiers Too Can Be Saved," by referring pointedly to Rom. 12:19, Matt. 7:1, Ex. 22:28, Acts 23:5; I Tim. 2:1 ff., Prov. 24:21, and Eccles. 10:20.[14] Luther assumed that the government would be benevolent. In one of his sermons at Weimar in October, 1522, he pictured the ideal ruler who serves his people after the analogy of Christ's selfless ministry.[15] Such a ruler would fall on his knees from time to time to entreat the Lord for guidance to rule with wisdom.[16] But even in cases where this ideal was not attained, even in cases where the ruler was clearly a tyrant (one who rules contrary to natural right), the Christian citizen was supposed to submit himself to the higher authority. Even if a tyrant requires of him his worldly goods, the Christian must obey. Luther never denied this, even late in his life.[17]

What has been said thus far of Luther's teaching on resistance must not be stretched farther than he himself carried it. Luther never taught that the Christian must obey his ruler unconditionally. The Christian was bound to obedience in earthly matters, but in matters pertaining to conscience and faith he was free from secular restraint. This Luther grounded especially on Acts 5:29, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Thus the Christian in certain cases might tell his ruler, "Dear Lord, I am bound to obey you with body and goods; command me according to your earthly power, and I will follow your command. But if you try to take from me my faith and Christian books, I will not obey." If the lord should then seize one's goods and punish this disobedience, the Christian would

14 WA. 19, 636. English translation in the Philadelphia edition of Luther's Works, V, 29-74.

15 WA. 10, III, 382.

16 *Ibid.*, 385.

17 Cf. WA. 19, 635-637, where the general theme is: "Und besser, das die Tyrannen hundert mal yhn unrecht thun, denn das sie den Tyrannen ein mal unrecht thun." See also Luther's remarks in the lectures on Romans, WA. 56, 123-124. Cf. his interpretation of I Pet. 2:17 in WA. 327-329 and 334-335.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

not chafe but would rather thank God that he was accounted worthy to suffer for the sake of the Word of God. But to surrender in matters of faith would, on the other hand, be a denial of God.[18] Worldly law and order do not extend beyond outward bodily things, and the Christian must be prepared even to risk his neck if his refusal to obey for conscience' sake leads to his death.[19]

Luther attempted to distinguish between *active* and *passive* resistance. It will be noted that in these earlier writings he allowed only passive resistance. Since Luther's time the distinction, whether correct or not, has been maintained in many treatises on the subject.[20] Assuming that the distinction may legitimately be followed, the difficulty of defining terms at once presents itself. Berggrav's definition, "Passive resistance is the refusal to cooperate . . . ," is inadequate, for active resistance is also the refusal to cooperate; furthermore, his definition will not at all serve the purpose of understanding Luther's treatment of the subject."[21] On the basis of a statement by Luther, the following definition may be synthesized: *Active* resistance signifies withstanding the government with force, while *passive* resistance is a resistance only by confessing the truth.[22] This definition likewise has its flaws, inasmuch as armed resistance might also be a confession of the truth, or a confession of the truth might involve a *de facto* revolution;[23] but the entire distinction is not above question, and Luther's own definition will best serve. Under passive resistance Luther suggested a number of remedies for difficult situations. Over against his oppressor, the Christian should pray that God might forgive his own sins and that God might remove his oppressor. At the same time he should continue to profess the Gospel bravely.[24] In more concrete situations the

18 WA. 11, 267.

19 WA. 12, 334-335.

20 The old distinction between active and passive resistance would appear to be untenable. Assuming that in some cases resistance might be justifiable, the question as to what form such resistance might take would be a civil and not a religious question. In the eyes of God a child's insult to his parents (passive resistance) is no less an infraction of the Fourth Commandment than if that child struck or even killed them (active resistance). When Luther boasted in 1522 that he had done more with words than many revolutionaries with swords (WA. 8, 683), he was begging the point. If it was ethical to resist at all, the validity of his disobedience could be measured not by the weapon he chose, but according to whether he was motivated by true love toward God and these same earthly authorities. If one has a right to resist at all, one is acting not for oneself but for God, and should choose the most effective means of carrying out one's task. As early as 1530 Luther had broadened his views considerably: "Auffrur ist nicht, wenn einer widder das Recht thut, Sonst müsten alle ubertrettung des Rechten auffrur heissen, Sondern der heisst ein auffrürer, der die Oberkeit und Recht nicht leiden wil, sondern greifft sie an und streit widder sie und wil sie unterdrucken und selbs Herr sein und Recht stellen. . . ." WA. 30, III, 283.

21 Berggrav, *op. cit.*, 368-369.

22 Cf. WA. 11, 277.

23 Luther himself admitted that he was a revolutionary, WA. 8, 683-684. Cf. also his repeated disobedience of Elector Frederick, as described in Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* (Nashville, 1950), 200, 205, 286, etc.

24 WA. 8, 682-683; TR. 4, No. 4555, No. 4669; 5, No. 5258.

Christian should refuse to bear arms if he believed it involved wrongdoing.[25] If worst came to worst, the oppressed could resort to flight from the dominions of his earthly lord.[26]

Luther had a great dread of revolution. He considered such a course unscriptural and unwise, opening the threat of anarchy. In 1522 Luther was opposed to active resistance even against the papists,[27] and although he had severely criticized the faults of the rulers, he now in turn campaigned energetically against the mad revolt of the peasants.[28] His thoughts on revolution during the 1520's involved at least four different considerations. (1) Luther felt that since the Reformation cause was a spiritual cause, much more could be accomplished by speaking and writing against existing evils than by an armed resistance against the papists. (2) Revolution knows no difference between right and wrong but becomes mad. *"Es hat keyn vornunft."* The innocent suffer with the guilty. (3) The principle of judging others and of exacting vengeance (*ius talionis*) is un-Christian. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord," Rom. 12:19. (4) Not Lutherans, but the devil wants a revolution. Otherwise Satan has no power against the Gospel, but a revolution would discredit the evangelical cause.[29]

In the fourth decade of the sixteenth century, as the political situation became more and more acute, Luther was no longer always sure that his earlier conclusions regarding revolution could be applied to the increasingly tense relationship between the emperor and the German princes.[30] Luther hesitated between the medieval, feudalistic view, in which the princes were little more than vassals of the emperor,[31] and the more modern view, that the princes were not mere subjects of the emperor but rulers in their own right, who as a matter of fact had through their electors appointed the emperor himself to his office. During this period Luther received considerable prompting from the jurists and from Philip of Hesse. In 1530 Luther, together with Justus Jonas and Philip Melanchthon, allowed himself to be persuaded by the jurists into signing a resolution which conceded that, according to secular laws, the German princes had the right to

25 "Wie? Wenn denn eyn furst unrecht hette, ist yhm seyn volck auch schuldig zu folgen? Anttwortt: Neyn. Denn wider recht gepürt niemant zu thun, Sondern man muss Gotte (der das recht haben will) mehr gehorchen denn den menschen." WA. 11, 277. Cf. WA. 39, II, 42 and 51.

26 WA. 19, 634.

27 WA. 8, 680.

28 WA. 18, 358. 11, 276-277.

29 WA. 8, 679-681. Cf. 19, 631, 635. See also 11, 276-277.

30 Cf. esp. WA. 30, III, 282-283.

31 Luther preached thus in the aforementioned sermon at Weimar in 1522, WA. 10, III, 385. Cf. the treatise "Von weltlicher Oberkeit," WA. 11, 276-277; English translation in Philadelphia edition of Luther's works, III, 223-274. In a letter of March, 1528, Luther referred to a possible uprising of the princes as a dreaded "Fürstenaufruhr" and referred in the same breath to the "Bauraufruhr" of 1525. Cf. WA. *Briefwechsel* (Weimar, 1930 ff.), hereafter cited as WBr. 4, 423. Cf. also WBr. 5, 259-260. See Luther's remarks from the autumn of 1531, TR. 2, No. 2285.

resist the emperor with force.[32] However unwilling and conditional may have been such approval by the Wittenberg theologians, the Reformer found himself at once faced by the displeasure of the Lutherans at Nuremberg. Luther replied in letters to Wenzeslaus Link and Lazarus Spengler that he had conceded the right to resist solely on the basis of the legal code, but that in his opinion resistance still lacked support from the theological point of view. The princes could still resist only as *membra corporis politici* (politicians) and not as *membra corporis Christi et corporis ecclesiastici* (Christians and churchmen).[33]

In his "Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen," also written in October, 1530,[34] Luther held that in the event that Charles V should march against the Lutherans the princes should resist him passively, that is, refuse to join forces with the emperor in fighting against their own side. Regarding self-defense Luther said that he should not wish it to be called revolt, and that it could be justified not theologically but juristically.[35] However, the matter at this time went no further than the theoretical stages. All was peaceably resolved in the Nuremberg Peace Treaty of 1532, which left to the Protestants an indefinite period of peace before the matter was to be settled by a future council or *Reichstag*.

The problem of resistance was reopened not by the emperor but by the pope. It was in the troubled days which gave rise to the Smalcald Articles in February, 1537, as well as in the following years that Luther at last raised his voice clearly, if cautiously, and asserted that active resistance to the emperor could in certain cases be justified. As early as 1537 Luther, together with Justus Jonas and Martin Bucer, signed a statement prepared by Melanchthon to the effect that the German electors and princes were in duty bound to arm themselves that they might protect their subjects in the event that the higher authority should attempt to compel them to return to "idolatry and forbidden divine worship." Just as a father is obligated to protect his family from murder, so were the princes bound to protect their citizens even if Charles V should march against them with arms, for murder is murder, even when committed by an unjust emperor.[36]

When Luther was asked on April 3, 1538, whether one might resist the emperor with force, he replied that children and families were involved, and that therefore the problem came under the domain of the jurists rather than that of

32 For documents related to the Torgau resolutions see WBr. 5, 661-664. Cf. with this the significant correspondence between Landgrave Philip and Luther, WBr. 4-6, *passim*. Although Philip was often too hasty in his judgments, his remarkable letter of Oct. 21, 1530 (WBr. 5, No. 1737), contained many points of view which later came to be accepted even by Luther.

33 WBr. 6, No. 1772 and 1796. Cf. also WA. 30, III, 282 f.

34 WA. 30, III, 276-320.

35 *Ibid.*, 282-283.

36 Ernst Ludwig Enders and Gustav Kawerau, *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel* (Leipzig: *Verein für Reformationsgesch.*, 1910), 12, 78-79. Enders-Kawerau dated this document 1539, but O. Clemens on the basis of more recent research has dated it as far back as 1537.

the theologians. But he added that if he himself were to decide the issue, he would favor fighting for the defense of these helpless ones.[37]

The political situation reached its crisis early in 1539. It was generally known that the pope intended to march against the evangelicals. Luther asserted that the pope was no prince, no magistrate, no tyrant, and that he therefore had no right whatsoever to attempt to punish the Protestant princes. Least of all did he have the right to coerce people in matters of faith. Therefore the Lutheran princes should rise up against him.[38] In the third week of March a letter arrived from Melanchthon, who was then attending a meeting at Frankfurt, reporting that the emperor was going to take sides with the pope in marching against the evangelicals. Luther said at table that the cause could no longer wait, and that, were he landgrave, he would take the offensive at once.[39] Luther seemingly had forgotten that in past years he had been a chief cause in hindering Landgrave Philip from doing that very thing! Luther expressed himself very outspokenly in his disputation of May 8 and 9, 1539:

> If one may resist the pope, one may also resist all the emperors and dukes who contrive to defend the pope. . . . The pope . . . wishes . . . every soul . . . to go to hell for his sake. Hence it is necessary that one march against his soldiers that war under him and go out to meet them, even though it mean a revolution. For we can not allow the damnation of souls. I am obliged to lay down my life for the emperor, but not my soul.[40]
>
> If the emperor defends the pope, who is a wolf, one is not to yield or stand for it, but one must attack him. . . . Self-defense is the natural course.[41]
>
> The princes must resist the tyrants, a thing which the First Table also requires. The emperor and Ferdinand are seeking first and foremost to get our goods, but still under the cover of the pope.[42]

Fortunately the invasion by Charles V did not materialize at that time. Nevertheless, the Reformers had reached their definitive doctrine on the problem of resistance.

In what was perhaps his last utterance on the subject, Luther in 1545 joined Melanchthon and three other Wittenberg theologians in signing a declaration which urged the continuation of the Smalcald League for the continued preservation of the Gospel cause. After the analogy of I John 3:16, it was argued that it was the duty of every Lutheran of Germany to support this coalition of force against the

37 "An resistendum caesari? . . . Hoc non est theologicum, sed iuridicum. . . . Hic nulla est quaestio, an non licet pugnare pro pietate, immo necesse est pugnare pro liberis et familia. Ego si potero, scribam exhortationem ad universum orbem pro defensione suorum. . . ." TR. 3, No. 3810.

38 WA. 39, II, 60. *Ibid.*, 42, 50, 57, 77, 83.

39 "Es ist nicht gut, lange harren; besser ists, man komme zuvor, ehe Andere kommen. Wenn ich Landgrafe wäre, so wollt ichs drein setzen und entweder unkommen oder sie umbringen, weil sie in einer sehr guten und gerechten Sache keinen Friede wollen geben. . . ." TR. 4, No. 4430.

40 WA. 39, II, 55-56.

41 *Ibid.*, 65-66.

42 *Ibid.*, 77.

emperor, for every Christian should be ready to lay down his life for his brother.[43]

Thus far we have traced Luther's development in the face of this problem of political ethics. In summary, we might formulate the Reformer's mature doctrine of resistance as follows:

1. Luther insisted that in all earthly matters which are under the jurisdiction of the rulers unconditional obedience be rendered, after Romans 13. This held even when the ruler was tyrannical, so long as only material things were involved.

2. However, when the ruler invaded the domain of faith and attempted to force one to do something contrary to one's convictions, the individual Christian could and should refuse to obey, in accord with Acts 5:29.

3. Inasmuch as the electors and princes were also duly constituted authorities with recognized functions, both in their dominions and in the empire at large, and inasmuch as they appointed the emperor himself, the emperor could not violate their rights or interfere with their carrying out their offices. Should he do so, the electors and princes could contest his action.

4. If the emperor sought to enlist their aid in a manifestly unrighteous cause, such as marching against brethren in the faith, the German lords should refuse to take part.

5. In certain cases where the emperor unjustly molested their subjects, the princes, as the legally constituted representatives and protectors of the people, should meet him with armed resistance. Such active resistance could however be offered only by those entrusted with the common interest. Mob action or irresponsible revolution could not be conceded.

Hence we see that Luther has been unjustly criticized. Luther propounded a political doctrine which was far ahead of the thinking of many of his contemporaries. One has only to compare the theocratic form of government advocated by John Calvin, with its total lack of understanding of the doctrines of vocation and of the two orders, to appreciate the superiority of Luther's grasp of political ethics. Luther was not a politician; he was a theologian. But when he was consulted on political problems, he feared those problems with ever-deepening insight.[44]

IV

A special warning must be given against the popular pastime of "proving" democracy on the basis of the writings of Luther or of any other Reformer. If it is true that many of our freedoms can be traced back to the monk of Wittenberg, the fact yet remains that Luther had no inkling of the problems that were to develop in the area of politics in the centuries following his death. It is true that democracy was not unknown in medieval Germany; for centuries previous to the birth of Luther democracy had flourished in the old free cities of the empire, such as

43 *Dr. Martin Luther's vermischte deutsche Schriften* (Erlangen, 1855), 65, 85.

44 "Ein grundlegender Fehler wurde damals allerdings auf lutherischer Seite gemacht: dass man die Theologen überhaupt gefragt hat!" Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, II (Munchen, 1953), 376-6.

Nuremberg and Hamburg. Nevertheless, current political problems are not to be solved by attempting to refer back to solutions of concrete situations made in Luther's time.

For the theologian in America there is the problem of defining American democracy. Is it a form of government in which the powers are invesetd in the people, as defined during the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, or is it a system in which the people, although exercising their right to vote, still recognize the divine authority of which St. Paul speaks? Is it a system in which the powers that be are ordained of the people, or in which the powers that be are ordained of God (Rom. 13)? Or, in other words, do the powers of our democracy stem from the people on the basis of a natural law, or do they come from God in such a way that those who are elected by the vote of the people are through the election invested with a power which comes from God and not from those by whom they have been elected? The question of the right to resist is intimately involved in one's definition of government.

The theologian of today can learn from the writings of Luther that there is a way to solve political problems—on the basis of conscience as enlightened by God's Word. The problem of the right to resist, like other kindred problems, must be submitted to the judgment of Rom. 13 and Acts 5:29 for a solution, and the answer then found must be held in spite of any or all so-called demands of the present.

The peculiar contribution of Martin Luther to the problems of political ethics lay in the fact that he recognized the organic relation between secular authority and the doctrines of vocation and the Fourth Commandment. Thus a distinctive sense of obedience to authority was inculcated in the thinking of Luther's spiritual descendants. It is no secret to the sociologist that the most law-abiding elements in America today stem from stock out of lands in which Lutheranism predominated. May that noble tradition be fostered! "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." This is the one emphasis. And the other is like unto it: "We ought to obey God rather than men!"

THE GENEALOGIES OF JESUS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE

By Uuras Saarnivaara

ONE OF THE MOST puzzling problems of the interpretation of the Scriptures is the difference between the genealogies of Jesus given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Some theologians have "solved" this problem by saying that they are obviously so different that no reconciliation is possible, that this discrepancy shows that the Bible is not reliable in every respect. Such a "solution," however, is all too easy and superficial.

William H. Bates published a booklet, *A Study in the Genealogy of Jesus,*[1] in which he sets forth a solution that seems plausible and according to which the two genealogies are not discordant but rather supplementary and both necessary to show that Jesus is (1) the lineal son of David "after the flesh" and (2) the legal heir of David's throne.

In I Kings God promises Solomon, "I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel." Peter said in his sermon on Pentecost: "God hath sworn with an oath to him [David] that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30).

There was, however, a man in the legal dynasty of David through whom the succession was forever barred. This man was Jechoniah, or Coniah, the king who was taken into exile in 597 by Nebuchadnezzar. In Jer. 22:29 f. the Lord says of him: "Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man [Jechoniah] childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David." This curse did not mean that Jeconiah and his descendants would be deprived of their *legal* right to the throne of David. But they should never *actually* sit on it. Neither did it mean that Jechoniah would have no children. It only meant that he should not have any reigning children. Thus the Messiah was to be of David's line after the flesh, but he could not belong to the descendants of Jechoniah. Joseph, the stepfather of Jesus, was in the royal line of David through Jechoniah, but he could not occupy it because of this inhibition.

Matthew's genealogy, therefore, gives the legal line of David, but it contains two counts against Jesus' eligibility to David's throne: first, he was not a fruit of David's body through Joseph, and second, even if he was counted as Joseph's son legally (as was done), as a member of the line of David through Jechoniah he could not occupy the throne because of the bar.

How could these obstacles be overcome?

Another genealogy was required through which Jesus was a natural descendant of David, but not through Jechoniah. The only possibility was that his mother Mary also belonged to the descendants of David.

But was Mary of the house of David?

According to the genealogy of Luke, Joseph was the son of Heli (3:23), but according to Matthew he was the son of Jacob (1:16). Obviously he could not be the son of two men at the same time. How can this be explained? Luke does not actually say that Heli *begat* Joseph. He refers to "Joseph, of Heli" (*tou Heli*), using the genitive case to combine the two. Translators usually add "the son," but it is not in the Greek text. Matthew states that Jacob begat Joseph, but Luke simply says that Joseph was Heli's. The probable meaning is that he was Heli's son-in-law. In Sam. 24:16 King Saul says: "Is it thy voice, my son David?" David was actually Saul's son-in-law.

In constructing their genealogical tables the Jews reckoned descent entirely

1 Christian Evidence League (Malverne, N. Y., 1952).

in the line of males. When the line passed from father to grandson through a daughter, the daughter herself was not named, but her husband was counted as the son of the maternal grandfather. It seems probable, therefore, that Joseph, the son of Jacob, was married to the daughter of Heli, that is, that Mary was a daughter of Heli, a descendant of David through his son Nathan (not the prophet), and that Joseph was therefore the son-in-law of Heli. He was put in the genealogy, according to Jewish custom, as the son of Heli.

Joseph's right to the Davidic throne was not voided by Jechoniah's inhibition, but only the occupancy of it. Thus Jesus had a right to the throne of David through his reputed, and legal (step) father Joseph, and was eligible to occupy it, to sit on it, as David's son through Mary, who was David's descendant through his other son, and so bypassed the inhibition of Jechoniah.

The two genealogies are therefore both necessary, Matthew giving the legal royal lineage from David through Solomon and Joseph, and Luke giving the natural lineage from David through Nathan to Mary, the former presenting the legal, the latter the natural, physical connection.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

Apocalyptic in Hungary

During the past seven years great changes have taken place in Hungary. Church leaders have been removed, "pensioned," and forced into oblivion. Church periodicals are almost nonexistent. The ones which are still allowed to appear are very poor substitutes for the theological journals and church papers of the past. Qualified and gifted leaders, writers, and professors have simply disappeared. Theology has been dwarfed into insignificance. Only a few sermons, third-rate exegetical studies, and a new translation of Luther's Small Catechism have been produced, and the Lutheran Church's sole national weekly has become a subservient mouthpiece of the state. The subsidized church is forced to become a tool of Soviet foreign policy. Regardless of which paper one reads, one cannot escape the feeling that the only power which fights for peace is Soviet Russia. When one goes to church to hear the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or when one attends a church convention, the "peace movement" is preached, explained, and taught.

When I had the privilege of talking to the delegates from Hungary at the World Council Assembly in Evanston, I was confirmed in my suspicion that the sole reason why they became "unwilling and reluctant" delegates was because they had no other alternative to follow. They had to come. An assignment was given them: to try to convince us in the West that the Soviet intentions are "peaceful." Their very presence was meant to convey that impression to us.

Everything fits into a well-arranged Soviet pattern. The June 4, 1954, issue of *Welwoche* reported: "According to the news service bureau the American State Department received a press memorandum which was prepared by Mao Tse Tung last year. This memorandum consists of a 'time table' of the Communist powers to occupy the world, which is planned for 1973. The memorandum recommends that the Soviet should try to grab world power without major wars. At all events the Soviets should try to avoid any major entanglements until such time as they can outstrip American production. They should try to isolate the United States." Emphasis on the "peace movement" in the church, in the press, and at conference tables has a great significance and fits perfectly into the Soviet plan.

On the other hand, a very encouraging symptom can be perceived in spite of all this. The leaders of the church know that their days are numbered. They acknowledge the fact that they have to be subservient to the state. But there is a very definite and determined resistance among the Christian people. It is passive resistance, and Mahatma Gandhi is an eloquent example of the effectiveness of passive resistance.

The leaders of the church are constantly being observed and controlled, but ever since the time of the Reformation Hungarians have known how to

get along. For centuries Protestants in Hungary have been oppressed and persecuted by both secular and ecclesiastical authorities. It has become second nature for them to resist. The very history of Hungarian Protestantism suggests that the Protestants in Hungary know how to manage in the face of oppression. One of the Evanston speakers, who received a tremendous ovation after his speech although he had been branded a Communist, told me during a private conversation that he deliberately and carefully selected Bible texts in an allegorical manner, thus trying to say things which he could not otherwise say. I am convinced that he was thoroughly sincere.

This is the only kind of resistance for today's Christians in countries where the church is oppressed. It is the preaching of the Word of God through allegory and illustrative parables. It is the way Jesus resisted the Pharisees and their legalistic machinations. It was effective in the apostolic age, and it is still effective and practiced in Hungary today.

JOHN L. E. DE PAPP

CHURCH CONGRESS IN GERMANY

Amid the complexities of Germany's Lutheranism the most dramatic and forceful expression of evangelical faith in 1954 is likely to be the Evangelical Kirchentag held in Leipzig, July 7-11. With 120,000 on hand for the opening service in Wilhelm-Leuschner Platz (city hall square), this sixth annual rally of Christian lay forces culminated in a gigantic closing service attended by 650,000. These figures, being the official estimates of the Red-controlled East German police, are not likely an exaggeration in favor of the church. In size this closing service surpassed anything in Protestant history. Yet size was significant primarily with regard to the decision each participant had to make in order to attend. Absences from home or village were noted. For the East German Lutherans—and only 20,000 came from the West—this was an unprecedented opportunity to meet with fellow Christians and together to "rejoice in hope." (See below for the complete text of the Leipzig Kirchentag Message.)

Heavy rains which fell during the session seemed miraculously to hold off for both the opening and the closing services. The young trudged faithfully, eagerly to the lectures and discussion periods, to the hours of Bible study and daily devotions, to the cultural programs and the informal gatherings where strangers discovered themselves friends. More than at any previous Kirchentag this one emphasized Christian adult education, particularly with respect to a thorough understanding of the Christian faith over against Communism and other ideologies. With an almost ominous amount of freedom vouchsafed by the East German government, theologians and laymen spoke with courage and insight of the fundamental issues which today divide the world. No one spoke without first weighing every word and counting the possible future cost. But everyone spoke in the full awareness of being a witness to Jesus Christ and of the need of relating faith in him to the needs of our day. So eagerly did the participants take notes on what was said that many came to speak of the Leipzig Kirchentag as "God's lecture hall."

In an unprecedented action direct from Moscow the huge Soviet Pavilion was turned over to the Christians. Outwardly its appearance is something like a church, with a tall spire surmounted by a big and ever-glowing red star. Within there stands a towering statue of Stalin, while at the base of the rotunda runs the proud affirmation, "The Works of Stalin Endure Forever." Yet within this hall, which is actually Russian and not German territory, some of the largest lecture and discussion groups met; for the most part, as some observed, "behind Stalin's back," who was peering out the front door. It was here that church flags and Scriptural mottoes created the visible signs of a profoundly moving and quietly attentive Christian atmosphere. Many sensed the electrifying paradox of the whole situation, and realized that it might never happen again. Therefore the leading of the Holy Spirit to bear bold witness to Jesus Christ seemed overwhelming. With grateful exultation the people caught up the Kirchentag theme, "Rejoice in hope" (Rom. 12:12)!

The study groups (as reported by the Ecumenical Press Service, July 21, 1954) based their deliberations on the daily Bible study of Revelation 1. In the first study group Johannes Hamel, pastor to students at the University of Halle (see LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, May, 1954, Germany), drew attention to the Christian knowledge of God's judgment and grace under the title, "The forgotten article of faith: Christ's return." Hamel stressed the distinction between the Christian view of history as fulfillment in God, on the one hand, and the Liberal and Marxist conceptions of progress, on the other. In the second study group Heinrich Vogel, professor both in East Berlin and in the Kirchliche Hochschule in West Berlin, spoke on "The image of the invisible God." He contrasted the Marxist man with the Christian conception of man. As the antithesis of the inhumanity of our age, he depicted the reality of Jesus Christ—"the only true man among all God's creatures." In the third study group Dr. Gustav Heinemann, president of the Synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany and a leading Christian layman, spoke on the subject, "In the kingdom of this King people love righteousness." An order based on justice, he said, could exist only where people and nations respect the divine origin of justice. Respect for justice is completely lost when it is reduced to a mere weapon in the struggle between conflicting interests and political programs.

The fourth group dealt with social questions, its theme, "The things of this world shall pass away," being explained by Pastor Schwade (Freiberg) in relation to people at work. He showed the only possible course for Christians in this world—a course which steered its way between worldliness, on the one hand, and escapism, on the other.

The fifth study group was particularly well attended. In it Dr. Anz, of Magdeburg, spoke on the subject, "Who holds the world in his hand?" He defined the position of the church in the face of the ideologies of East and West: "We Christians do not want struggles and conflicts with the state, but we do want to live in accordance with our faith. We are not prepared,

however, to follow any kind of ideology and to act against our conscience. The classless society of Communism will not achieve perfection in an earthly paradise, nor will the 'free world' do so either. That is why we cannot share the enthusiasm of Communism nor the religious fervor that is becoming more and more apparent in the political decisions of the Western world." In the same study group, Klaus von Bismarck, head of the social institute at Villigst (Ruhr), and himself a refugee, gave what many judged the most stimulating address of the entire Kirchentag. Speaking on "The Christian view of property," he declared that the loss of property was most significant for all who had been driven out of the East. "I see," he stated, "no way of returning there without another war and another terrible panic. In my opinion history—and God is the Lord of history—has already transformed the system of property there. . . . In the Christian view, property is never a personal possession to which the individual has a right. . . . If we meet here as Christians from the eastern and western zones in order to free ourselves from certain political slogans, we must overcome the idea that the capitalist order of property accepted in the West deserves a Christian halo. But we must reject with equal soberness the expectation that the communal property system will give men more freedom."

Dr. Reinold von Thadden-Trieglaff, president of the Kirchentag, summed up the significance of this occasion for Christians in Germany and beyond: "This Leipzig Kirchentag will become an inherent part of the movement for ecumenical unity and the life of Protestant Christians." This was in keeping with the Kirchentag's theme, which had been chosen for its bearing on the theme of the second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, "Christ—the Hope of the World."

Message of the Church Congress

"From the Kirchentag in Leipzig we send greetings to all brothers and sisters, East and West, in the words of Jesus Christ: 'My peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. Not as the world do I give it you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.'

"In this peace we were assembled together, to the joy of the congregation here gathered and to the amazement of the world. Even so we have again been alarmed by the tensions and contrasts in the political and spiritual life of the two regions in which we must live separated from one another. We are facing up to this need. For we have experienced the healing power of the peace which Christ gives to us. This peace has enabled us to listen to one another, and to understand one another. This peace has created joy and humor out of faith.

"We have been shamed by our tiredness, impatience, and bitterness. Whoever lives in the peace which Christ grants has the right neither to indifference nor to despair. Even though our expectations in international relations are today shattered, the peace which Christ bestows is nevertheless *the* reality. For, thanks be to God, he gives us peace not as the world gives it. His peace is final and of overwhelm-

ing power. Whether we in East and West will soon be re-united is beyond anyone's knowledge. There may be a long and hard way ahead of us. There is the danger that one part of us will collapse exhausted, while the other part makes itself secure. We neither dare nor desire to do that. We keep on holding fast to one another. For the peace of Christ among us exercises its might. Because we together praise Jesus Christ, we do not separate from each other. Because we confess Jesus Christ, we pray for one another. Because all of us together love him, we all help to bear one another's burdens. Because we are thus sustained by his peace, we do not permit ourselves to be driven to hate one another.

"In this peace which Christ bestows, we return home from Leipzig to our congregations in East and West. May God protect us on our common journey that we may ever remain together under the watchword of this hour: 'Rejoice in your hope, be patient in tribulation, be constant in prayer.'" (Source: *Evangelischer Pressedienst,* July 11, 1954, p. 1.)

E. Theodore Bachmann

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Christian Hope and the Second Coming. By Paul S. Minear. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 220 pages. $3.50.

Of books about the Evanston theme, there seems no end. Here is a stimulating one, by an American member of the Advisory Commission of Theologians, which prepared the report on "Christ, the Hope of the World." In fifteen short chapters, seven of which have previously appeared in various journals, the author seeks "to clarify issues rather than solve them," by examining biblical material, especially in three areas "where American churchmen experience the greatest separation from churchmen of other continents" (p. 11 f.): (1) the wide range of meanings hope has; (2) "the degree to which the Bible is accepted as a primary norm for the conception of Christian hope" (p. 12); and (3) the "so-called Second Coming," an un-biblical phrase which, Dr. Minear holds, unfortunately suggests an Advent which may be dated by the calendar.

The author devotes the first eighty pages of his work to the structure of Christian hope; its "associations with the gospel as a whole are analyzed, with special attention centered on points where Christian hope is qualitatively distinct from general human hoping" (p. 13). Hope in the "uniquely Christian sense," he finds, is dominated by a personal relationship with God, and refers not to a vague future possibility but springs from the reality of what God has already done; it is one, exclusive hope, yet it is inclusive of all men and has meaning for each moment in life; hence it is "non-detachable" from the other parts of the life of faith.

In the light of such hope, typical scenes in the NT are then examined: Paul before Festus, on trial for hope; Abraham, in Romans, as an example of a man who "hoped against hope" and "rested solely on God's power" as over against all human hopes; hope as one of the spiritual gifts, along with faith and love, provided by God's grace (I Cor. 12-13); and finally, as the anchor of the soul, in the mixed metaphor of Heb. 6:19-20.

Although the author warns that a "Second Coming" is "by no means the only way of describing the goal of hope in the New Testament," Part II turns to examine "the primary meanings of the expected return of Christ," particularly some of the images biblical thought uses to describe it. Among these are the idea of Jesus as "the Thief who comes suddenly in the night;" the Keys of Heaven; the cry, "Come, Lord Jesus"; and such apocalyptic details as the clouds of heaven, earthquakes, and the trumpet-call.

Throughout, the writer seeks to steer between the literalism of the fundamentalists who demand a "visible coming" as the necessary consequence of verbally inspired scriptures, and the viewpoint of the modernists who repudiate verbal inspiration and with it reject any return of Christ as an "implicit denial of his living presence" now (p. 87). His own conclusion is that the expectation of Christ's return in the early church "was not in itself constitutive of Christian hope as a whole, but neither was it a marginal or accidental encumbrance on Christian life. The living Christ was himself constitutive of the hope; expectation of his final decisive victory was an important corollary of life in him" (p. 97). This hope continues necessary to the Christian life, he adds, in a helpful chapter on the delay of the promise (II Peter 3), but "we do not enter the door of Christian hope by accepting an inherited doctrine of the Second Coming, but by being transformed into heirs through the death and resurrection of Christ" (p. 207).

This book is impressive in its careful linguistic and textual foundations. Dr. Minear has an especial talent for succinct analysis of the setting of a passage—e.g., the fac-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

tions within the church at Rome (p. 46 f.). His neat and often alliterative outlines will appeal to some preachers; thus, hope has a "ground, goal, and goad" (ch. 1), while earthquakes are connected with "revelations, revolutions, and restorations" (ch. 16).

The exegesis is solid, striking at times because it runs counter to usual views. The broad concept of hope, for example, allows it to be taken as an equivalent of faith at Rom. 8:24. " 'Justified by faith' is one way of describing God's work. 'In . . . hope we were saved' is another way. The two ways describe the same salvation. . . . Faith is the activity of seizing the hope of the gospel" (p. 68). Thus, *tē elpidi* can be a dative of means (so AV, "by hope"), not simply a dative of mode (so RSV, most commentators). The "naked man" of Mark 15:51 f. is held to be not just the author's "self-exposure," the usual interpretation, but a symbol of man's nakedness before God at the Day of Judgment, a meaning suggested by other writers (cf., e.g., *Interpreter's Bible* VII, 886, where it is also connected with Amos 2:13 ff.) but not with such thorough development as here. Dr. Minear does not hesitate to see such "double meanings" in NT stories, "relevance for the praying congregation as well as the original participants" (p. 109).

The treatment of the Defeat of the Dragon (Rev. 12-14) is most likely to arouse discussion. The author connects these chapters with the letter to the Church at Pergamum (Rev. 2:12-17), so that "the Pergamum problem [is] related to a cosmic conflict" (p. 154). As he has argued elsewhere (cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature,* June, 1953, 93-102), the Sea Beast is the Roman Empire, and the "mortal wound which healed" is not *Nero redivivus* after his suicide, but refers to the effect of Christ's cricifixion, when "the slain Lamb inflicted on the Dragon the plague of death" (p. 159), which however to the world appeared healed. The Earth Beast is now apparently identified with "a more insidious threat . . . within the congegations, mediated by the smooth-talking descendants of Balaam (2:14 f.)" (p. 159)—i.e., appeasing Christians, and not priests of the Emperor cult. If this latter identification is correct, what then are the "great wonders" of the Earth Beast (13:13)? And how can he "cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed" (15:15), if he is equated only with the Balaam party *within* the church? What little we know of the Balaamites at Pergamum suggests their failing was a "liberal" view toward idols and idol-meats, which is not necessarily the same as Emperor worship (2:14). Further, if "all the major characters in the action of ch. 2 reappear in ch. 12" (p. 154), where do we find the Nicolaitans of 2:15? And ought we look for parallels to the problems of the other six churches in the later chapters of Revelation? One hopes (not just as a "vague future possibility" but on the ground of what he has already done) that the author will soon fulfill his intention (cf. *JBL,* p. 101) to relate this interpretation of the wounded beast to the number 666 and to Rev. 17:9-18, as well as to the apparent *Nero redivivus* motif of 9:13 ff.

One final matter. The book, probably wisely, limits itself to biblical materials alone. But are there not some areas where extra-biblical sources for "images . . . alien to our Western imagination" ought to be used? To cite an example, to what extent is the "clouds of heaven" motif a common detail in many ancient religions (cf. "cloud-wrapped Zeus" of the Greeks; on clouds as a frequent device for divine epiphanies in Homer, see M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion,* p. 161)? Are not some of the OT uses of cloud derived directly from Israel's neighbors, such as the concept of a god who "rideth upon the clouds" from Ras Shamra (cf. Ps. 104:3 with *Ancient Near East Texts,* p. 132, c, 11)? And especially, should not the writings of the Inter-testamental period be considered as an important bridge to New Testament apocalyptic? (I noted no citations from non-canonical works, except Barnabas, p. 67.)

Such questions, of course, and even disagreements are inevitable after reading a book of this sort; but in some sense they are indicative of the book's worth. For one aim of the author is, as he says, to show "how alien is the biblical imagination from ours [and to] stimulate ours to fresh activity" (p. 147). Along such lines may lie the most important results of Evanston.

JOHN REUMANN

The Apostle Paul: His Message and Doctrine. By Olaf Edvard Moe. Translated by L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 489 pages.

Dr. Olaf Moe, the author of this significant volume, is one of the ablest New Testament scholars in Europe. Born in Norway in 1876, he completed his theological education in 1900 and pursued graduate studies in Germany in 1901-1903. From 1906 to 1916 he taught at the University of Oslo. Since 1916 he has been on the faculty of the Independent Theological Seminary in Oslo, where he has occupied the chair of New Testament Exegesis. From 1923 to 1926 he served as president of the institution. A prolific writer, he has produced among other important works two outstanding volumes on Paul, both of which have been translated into English by Dr. L. A. Vigness. They are: *The Apostle Paul, His Life and Work* and its sequel, the volume under review.

In preparing these volumes for English readers Dr. Vigness, who was an editor, teacher, scholar, churchman, and one-time president of St. Olaf College, has rendered theological scholarship an inestimable service. That he took great pains to present accurately the thought of the original is in evidence in the many instances in which he points out the Norwegian idiom in relation to the New Testament Greek and English rendering.

Although there has been some delay in the issuance of the English translation, considerable care has been exercised by the publishers to bring the material up to date. For example, reference is made to recent contributions to New Testment theology by Rudolf Bultmann (p. 9). The volume is set forth in excellent type and format, with copious notes and extensive bibliographies. Lacking, however, is an index, which always adds to the usefulness of a work of this character.

Turning to the contents, we note the scholarly yet conservative character of the studies made by Dr. Moe. In his introduction he analyzes critically recent research on Paul and states his own objectives in writing. His survey of studies in Pauline thought during the past century is very instructive. He observes with deep insights the vagaries of such scholars as Baur, Holsten, Pfleiderer, Weinel and Wrede, and also characterizes objectively the studies of von Hofmann, B. Weiss, A. Schlatter, Paul Feine, and many others. He regards the dilemma of interpreting Paul in terms of either Jewish or Hellenistic influences as resolved only in the view of a Christian revelation carrying objectively threads of both backgrounds. In his own treatment he proceeds in Part I to set forth Paul's missionary message to Jews and Gentiles against the background of the common views crystallized by the early Christian church in its catechetical instruction. On the basis of this revelation he delineates in Part II the distinctive doctrines developed by the apostle.

Paul's gospel, Dr. Moe observes, is not a peculiar Pauline type of Christianity, as if he were the founder of the faith, but a real revelation, something independent of the apostle, yet colored by his personal testimony and freedom of expression. By this approach the author is able to point out the close relationship between Paul's early missionary message and the common Christian instruction in the primitive church.

In setting forth the Pauline theology in Part II Dr. Moe devotes a section to the discussion of the sources and twelve chapters to distinctive doctrines, namely, God and the world, the nature of man, sin and death, God's plan of salvation, justification by faith, the state of grace, the church, ethics, the doctrine of predestination, and eschatology.

The apostle, the author makes clear, presents no specific system of theology, yet his writings reveal an inner coherence. Trained in rabbinic methods of exegesis, he gives evidences of his Hebrew heritage and at the same time he manifests his independence as a thinker and interpreter of the Word of God. Guided by the Spirit he always approaches the Old Testament in the light of his conversion experience. He is quite familiar with and makes use of both the Hebrew Scriptures and the Septuagint, the Greek translation, yet the majority of his quotations appear to be from memory. The Old Testament he interprets as God's prophetic book pointing to the Christ. Although his background in Judaism was very beneficial, he deals with

the Scriptures not in terms of rabbinic casuistry but through spiritual understanding.

Dr. Moe seeks to interpret Paul by repeated reference to the Greek text of his epistles and particularly to the meaning which Paul attaches to Greek words, phrases, and idioms in setting forth his thought. He arrives at his conclusions after a careful comparison of passages and their contexts.

For the most part the Norwegian scholar reaches conservative conclusions, yet he deals always critically with the text and especially with the theories advanced by other interpreters of Pauline thought. For example, in dealing with the Pauline concept of the wrath of God (p. 146 ff.), he holds as untenable the anthropomorphic view of Dodd and others and the exclusively eschatological theory of Ritschl. Paul's idea of judgment, he asserts, is objective, the outpouring of divine wrath in the present as well as at the end of time.

As would be expected of a Lutheran scholar, considerable attention is given by Dr. Moe to the Person of Christ in Pauline thought, his pre-existence, incarnation, vicarious atonement, death, resurrection, and promised return. The argument is presented in a convincing manner that Paul regards the pre-existence of Christ not as ideal but as actual and real, that he sets forth not an anthropocentric but a theocentric Christology, and, in short, that his teachings are in remarkable accord with the teachings of Jesus and the early apostles, Gunkel, Bousset, Wrede, and others to the contrary notwithstanding.

This volume is deserving of wide distribution. Pastors, teachers, and all other students of Paul will find it a very useful and inspiring work by reason of its scholarly insights, reverent approach, sane exegesis, and constructive conclusions.

E. E. Flack

Fire in Thy Mouth. By Donald C. Miller. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 153 pages. $2.50.

The title of this book makes an initial appeal to this reviewer. Its words were once considered as the title of his own studies in the message of Jeremiah. The author's stated purpose, too, elicits a response from this teacher of homiletics who is seeking to promote a greater and more faithful use of the Bible in preaching.

In his opening chapter Dr. Miller establishes his distinctive concept of the preacher's task. "An authentic word from God through a poor human agent is true preaching, whereas a sermon which does no more than communicate human ideas is not true preaching at all. To introduce men to God so that they and he have dealings with each other is an event of abiding, eternal value, no matter how crude the introduction. On the other hand merely to talk about God without his being present is spiritually worthless, no matter how eloquent or enjoyable the speech. The function of the preacher is to announce to men the amazing news so much greater than he is that men shall lose sight of the preacher in the news. What is the news? God himself is present with us! The redeeming God is actively present, judging and redeeming men in the solemn realities of this moment. Then God really becomes the Preacher. The sermon is no longer the effort of a man to speak moving words; it has become the Deed of God."

Preaching, for the author, is the proclamation of the whole truth of God, revealed in the redemptive act of Jesus Christ. It is *kerygma* and not merely *didache*. And since this *kerygma* is revealed in the Bible, the preacher's source and message must be the "Word of the Lord."

The materials of this volume were developed from lectures given at the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary. They explore, in five well articulated chapters, the reasons and the temptations for the neglect of biblical preaching, the place of the Bible in preaching, the task of the preacher as an interpreter of the Bible, the values of biblical preaching, and its implications.

Each reader of this work will find his own points of special interest. For myself the stress upon the total message of the Bible, the "redemptive" Deed, and the chapter setting forth the values of biblical preaching, are most important. They unite to present to students for the ministry, and preachers in their parishes an earnest plea for the under-

standing and use of the Bible to proclaim Christianity's unique message.

A thorough acquaintance with the Bible, sound insights, a background of pastoral, as well as teaching experience, and an excellent illustrative art contribute to the making of a helpful and stimulating book. One mild criticism of its presentation is that there seems to be overfrequent use of older preachers and their methods as examples. They may not always "ring a bell" in the modern mind. But the general presentation, content and illumination are most commendable.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

The Gospels Translated into Modern English. By J. B. Phillips. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953. 243 pages. $2.75.

New translations of the Scriptures nearly always have to fight their way into public favor. In some cases years elapse before they begin to strike fire. Mr. Phillips has been more fortunate. His publishers report that "more than a hundred thousand readers have rejoiced in the discovery of the now world-famous *Letters to Young Churches.*" The reception which the companion volume on the Gospels will touch off is likely to prove even more generous and enthusiastic.

A full-length critical comparison of the new translation with the Greek text would make THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY burst at its seams. In numerous passages the reviewer cannot go along with Mr. Phillips—or with any other translator, for that matter. This only serves to show that, strictly speaking, translation is impossible. Every translation is necessarily not only an interpretation of the original but also a compromise with it. The limitations of language and the shackles of idiom combine to keep the translator from giving his readers the full and precise sense of the original. He must rest content with approximations. Moreover, the passages in which there are legitimate grounds for differences of opinion concerning the exact meaning are far more numerous than the Greekless suppose.

Brilliant as the new translation is, it seems mildly deficient on two counts. For one thing, it does not do full justice to the poetical units. The magnificent poetry in the first two chapters of the Third Gospel, for example, is not even printed as poetry! Then too, the translator seems less sensitive to Semitic overtones and undertones than to Greek and English idioms. His translation of the Beatitudes is a case in point. As an able paraphrase of a chain of Greek sayings it can, of course, be defended, but it is not redolent with the mystical, poetical, and deeply Semitic piety which the Beatitudes exhale.

What lies at the roots of the extraordinary vogue of the Phillips translations? The decisive factor seems to be the English style, its freshness and pungency, its vigor and lucidity. Like his friend and sponsor, Mr. C. S. Lewis, the translator writes English, not a hybrid, stilted, monkish drivel, but the virile and expressive English which top-flight journalists and men of letters are currently exploiting. He put in a tour of duty as a journalist between two periods of service as a vicar. No doubt his major in English and the Classics at Cambridge gave him a good start, but it does not tell the whole story about the man. He stands revealed in his style as a man who has not spent all his years browsing around in ivory towers. Like Luther, he has lived in close touch with people and mastered the art of speaking to them in language which they love. To paraphrase Luther's words, Mr. Phillips does not ask the Greek letters how to speak English. He turns to ordinary people and "looks them in the mouth to see how they speak." Then he does his translating. He has the good sense to realize that an honest paraphrase is nearly always more "literal" than a slavishly wooden translation of Greek phrases. That is what makes his translations so readable.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

The Crisis in the Life of Jesus. By Ernest F. Scott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 152 pages. $2.50.

This book was read and annotated by Professor A. C. P. Hays of Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis, shortly before his death last year. Declining health prevented him from writing the review which he was

asked to prepare. It has fallen to the lot of the present reviewer to submit a substitute evaluation, less competent, but not inadequate, he hopes. What a long and interesting series of books by E. F. Scott has come from the press since 1914 when his Ely Lectures, *The Beginnings of the Church,* appeared! The present volume, no less than the earliest products of his mind and heart, is marked by vigor, freshness, balance, and thoroughness; yet there is no display of the apparatus of his learning in either footnotes or bibliographical references. All the footnotes except one are to scripture references. No contemporary name of a theologian or a biblical scholar appears. Leaving their contentions to one side, Dr. Scott goes to the heart of his subject and presents it in an intelligible and an original way which will command the reader's attention.

The subject is the cleansing of the temple at Jerusalem by Jesus in the last week of his earthly life. To this one subject, viewed from almost every possible exegetical, historical, and doctrinal angle, our author devotes one hundred and fifty pages. The fullness of treatment will be appreciated when one compares with it the length of the article on the cleansing of the temple in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,* Vol. II (1908). This latter is a little less than two columns long, being a sub-section under the article "Temple." Certainly Scott's monograph is the fullest treatment in English theological literature, and perhaps in any literature, on this critically significant event in the life of our Lord.

Why does this writer make so much of what appears to be so little? It is because he believes that the single action of Jesus in the cleansing of the temple, with its firm foundation in New Testament history, reveals so much of Jesus' own thought, attitude, and intention as to be virtually a key to our understanding of his whole mission and ministry.

In order to establish his position, Scott is compelled to meet the objections of modern skepticism as to the reality and the historicity of the temple-cleansing. He does this most admirably and lucidly in his first two chapters. With reference to the incident itself, Scott declines to force a harmony between the Synoptics and John. He concludes that the cleansing occurred once, not twice, and that it was timed by Jesus as a frontal attack on the priestly hierarchy at Jerusalem in the week of the crucifixion.

Chapter Three relates the act of the cleansing to Jesus' ministry as a whole. In the following two chapters Scott is at his best as he seeks to probe with reverence the inner consciousness of our Lord in (a) his realistic, yet spiritual attitude towards the temple and (b) his motives for cleansing it. The method of our author in these middle chapters reminds one of Adolf Deissmann's method of "indirect observation" in his fascinating study a generation ago of the inner life of our Lord in *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul.* Scholars of the school of Dibelius and Bultmann have since tended to deny the validity of this method and have contended that we can know Jesus only as the early church *believed* him to be and not *as he was* in himself within the historic limits of his earthly life. It is nevertheless refreshing and convincing to see Deissmann's method revived and applied by a master in this new volume.

The climax of Scott's argument is reached in Chapter Six with the theme, "The Messianic Claim." Contrary to those who have strenuously denied that Jesus thought of himself as the Messiah in any sense, and in opposition to Wrede who maintained that Jesus sought to the very end to keep his messiahship a profound secret, Scott declares (p. 95): "It is true, then, that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah." He adds, "He had his own conception of the Messiah, and he derived it, not from prophecy or tradition, but from a source within him. . . . It is not too much to say that the old messianic idea was for Jesus little more than the block of marble which grew into form and meaning under the sculptor's hands." "Thus, while declaring himself the Messiah, Jesus gave a new significance to the title and he indicated this by his action in the temple" (pp. 95, 96).

We find ourselves in full sympathy with this view, in the main, and partially out of sympathy on one count. We agree with Scott that messiahship meant to Jesus that "he

thought as God did" and that "his one aim was to fulfill God's purposes." We do not agree with the further statement (p. 97): "It mattered little whether he answered at all points to that Coming One whom prophets had seen in vision." This agrees badly with the constant reiteration of Jesus that the Scriptures concerning himself must be fulfilled, "that thus it must be" (Matt. 26-54). This certainly does not mean that Jesus would pick and choose which prophetic scriptures should be fulfilled in himself and which should not, among the many that really concerned him!

The distinction which Scott fails to make here is vital. The prophecies of the Coming One given in the Old Testament meant something to those who first uttered them. They doubtless meant another thing to those who first heard them. To the dull-minded disciples about A. D. 29 they meant still another thing, and something else again to Jesus himself. It was he, the Lord, who in action and suffering gave form and point to many an Old Testament prophecy which otherwise would remain forever mysterious and meaningless to men unilluminated by his Spirit.

In Chapter Seven on "The Sequel to the Cleansing" there is a discriminating discussion of the complicated circumstances surrounding the trials of Jesus by his Jewish and Gentile judges. The question of men's responsibility for Jesus' death is wisely faced. "Perhaps it is the chief tragedy of the Crucifixion that it was not the work of criminals but of men who were earnestly trying, according to their lights, to do what was right. . . . More often than not the worst of evils have been wrought by well-meaning men" (p. 120).

The book is brought to a fitting conclusion by the chapter on "Historical and Religious Value." To those who would urge that Jesus' violence on this occasion, if historical, was out of keeping with what we otherwise know of his character, Scott replies concerning the act of driving out the merchants and moneychangers, "It discloses one side of Jesus' nature which might be overlooked as we contemplate the rest of the history. Behind his gentleness and forbearance there was a reserve of strength and fiery resolution" (p. 131). "A good shepherd . . . will defend his flock against wolves and robbers although it costs him his life" (p. 132). The conflict between Jesus and the priestly guardians of the temple who had profaned it was essentially one of authority. Hence the train of events which led to Jesus' death. "It was only the expected messiah who could thus assert himself as Lord of the temple" (p. 145).

This book is an excellent Life of Christ in miniature, setting the Jesus of history in full relation with the historic temple at Jerusalem at a crucial moment 'in the fulness of time."

WILLIAM H. COOPER

Jeremiah, Prophet of Disaster. By Virginia G. Millikin. New York: Association Press, 1954. 155 pages. $2.

Queen Esther, Star in Judea's Crown. By Laura Long. New York: Association Press, 1954. 156 pages. $2.

The two books here reviewed are the first of a new series of popular biographies on biblical, reformation, and missionary leaders, which will utilize the talents of successful writers in the field especially of juvenile literature. It is being launched with the conviction that the lives of men and women who have helped create our religious heritage are "as colorful, exciting, dramatic, and heroic as the lives of great explorers, scientists and founders of our country." The series which is entitled "Heroes of God" will include such religious figures as Joshua, David, Solomon, Peter, Luke, ,Wyclif, Luther, and Tyndale.

The problem of capturing the interest of teen-age youth today, nurtured as they have been on stories of Superman and Dick Tracy, is a major one. Therefore any attempt to dramatize and humanize the true life stories of great spiritual leaders is to be welcomed. Such an attempt should, however, have a reasonable semblance of truth.

Virginia Millikin, who is the author of some three hundred published short stories and articles, most of them for young people, has aptly demonstrated her imaginative ability in telling the story of Jeremiah, the great prophet of the last days of Jerusalem, who

lived and labored for forty years, warning his people to no avail of the doom to come. The result is an interesting, well told tale. It contains, however, more fiction than fact. A large part of the book deals with the early unknown period of Jeremiah's life, whereas the exciting closing years of his ministry leading up to the fall of Jerusalem are telescoped, with failure to utilize all the biblical material available. Many of the names familiar from the biblical account have been woven into the account. Fictitious characters have also been added and given a prominent role. This is true of Tabitha, the boyhood sweetheart of Jeremiah, who remains ever faithful to him and never marries, despite his stern rejection of her love, in obedience to the Lord's command not to take a wife. The book ends with an incredible account of her treading across the debris of the ruined city of Jerusalem in order to bid farewell to the aged Jeremiah, before being taken captive to Babylon.

One gains little conception of the dramatic power of Jeremiah as a prophet from this book. Not even the more vivid of his messages are quoted.

Mrs. Long, in contrast to Mrs. Millikin, has made excellent use of the biblical material in fashioning her story of *Queen Esther, Star in Judea's Crown.* As an experienced writer of biographies for young people, she has provided vivid and authentic background to the story of this famous Jewish heroine who became a symbol to the Jewish people of how God had watched over them and protected them from persecution. Mrs. Long favors the view of many modern Christian and Jewish biblical scholars that Esther is probably only a fictitious character, yet she has told her story in such a convincing fashion that she has made the orphaned Hadassah, who became a queen and saved her people from destruction, come alive.

ROBERT H. BOYD

The Names of Jesus. By Vincent Taylor. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1953. 175 pages. $3.

The titles of Jesus Christ record both the revelation about him and devotion to him.

This series of lectures at Oxford, presenting a colorful study of all the names of Jesus to be found in the New Testament, is analytical, appreciative, comprehensive, and compact. Fifty-five names are carefully examined, interpreted and evaluated. They present a full length portrait of the person of Christ and serve as valuable testimonies and expressions of the personal devotion and liturgical usage of Christians from early days of the church down to the present time.

The names studied are arranged into three periods: 1. The historic ministry of Jesus. 2. The first generation of the Christian mission, A.D. 30-65. 3. The second generation, A.D. 65-100. In each period attention is called to the names which have passed out of use, and those which became the precious permanent possession of the church.

It is significant that the church has since added only one name of Christ to an acceptable list, *Redeemer.* All other uninspired titles are "either pietistic or humanistic, laudatory or noncommital. They say too much or too little."

One turns to the Scriptures from this illuminating study enriched and equipped to read with keener insight the passages containing the names of our Lord Jesus, the Christ.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection. By D. T. Niles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953. 93 pages. $2.

D. T. Niles is a Methodist minister from Ceylon. He has won an enviable reputation as a Christian leader of youth and as a preacher. At one time he was chairman of the World Student Christian Federation. At the Amsterdam meeting of the World Council of Churches he was chosen to preach the assembly sermon. He is the author of several books with a wide sale in America and is a frequent contributor to our religious journals. This little book contains the substance of four lectures on preaching, given in 1952 under auspices of Parkin College, Adelaide, Australia.

The four lectures are entitled, The Signature of Hope, The Signature of Death, The Signature of Love, and The Signature of Life. Dr. Niles explains that across the face

of all human existence God writes these four signatures. The deepest meaning of hope, death, love and life are to be found in the gospel of the resurrection. A very minor criticism would question the lecture titles. The word "signature" has only casual relevance.

While I do not recall the author's use of the word grace more than twice, he sounds the grace note with no uncertain emphasis. We must be driven to the conviction "that we have nothing to preach excepting the proclamation given us in our call. All that we have is God's, but I have nothing except his word which found me, and his word to the proclamation of which I have been sent" (p. 19). "Preaching," he continues, "would be folly if it were not that preaching is simply the human contribution that is brought to the service of the active operation of the word of God" (p. 23). The call is a shattering experience, in which self dies. Jonah is cited as an example. Jonah was resurrected in hope as the gospel of the resurrection was proclaimed, bringing hope to repentant Nineveh. Jesus captures our lives, as God captured Jonah. Then we become usable to proclaim hope to every Nineveh.

Dr. Niles does not sentimentalize death. "First, death is the consequence of sin. Second, death is God's provision for sinful man. And third, death is already defeated" (p. 40). "It is good that sinful man does die. For life would be insupportable if men just grew old and older and never died. . . . When at the last death does come, man makes his final act of faith, casting himself upon God's grace who, beyond death, will receive with forgiveness the human spirit" (pp. 40-41).

"The correlate of death is not birth," writes the author, "except in the case of the race. The true correlate of death is immortal love" (p. 64). "Our life on earth is a period of pilgrimage, it is our journey from Egypt to Canaan; our life beyond death is a period of settlement, of our inheritance in the land of the saints" (p. 68). Regarding hell Dr. Niles says, "We can speak of it only as a predicament in which man can choose to be. . . . Existence in hell . . . has always the quality of eternity" (p. 70). "Thus is death challenged at every step by love, the love of God being set over against the hell within which men continue to shut themselves" (p. 74). The mark of God's love is the cross with which he crosses out man's sin.

The last lecture begins with Psalm 90. Dr. Niles says, "In this great hymn of life and death there are worked out the two themes that belong together: man's dying because he is a sinner, and his living because he is loved by God" (p. 77). Man's search for security is satisfied only in faith. "Seek first the kingdom of heaven" does not mean to seek your place in the kingdom. That is in God's hands as soon as we believe in Christ. But the kingdom is at war and our security is at once shattered by our involvement, and confirmed by our faith.

There is a logical development of thought through the four lectures. Dr. Niles' theology is evangelical and there is no synergism in this series of lectures. His power lies in the use of words and phrases outside the trite vocabulary of average preaching. He is also a master of illustration. Many illustrations come from his Asiatic experiences, many more from the Bible. But the range of his references shows wide reading and a retentive memory.

It is difficult to do justice to a book of this character in any critical digest. I found the book well worth reading. It would be a timely book to add to a preacher's list in preparation for Lenten sermonizing.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

The Religious Bodies of America. By F. E. Mayer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1954. 587 pages. $8.50.

Publications dealing with the various religious groups in the United States and Canada have been numerous in recent years. This volume must be estimated in comparison with the others.

Dr. Mayer has written from a theological and a Lutheran point of view. The result, therefore, is quite different from the mere thumb-nail sketches of the *Handbook of Denominations in the United States* by F. S. Mead, 1951, or the collection of essays by denominational historians in *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage,* edited by Vergilius Ferm, 1953. It is more than a brief

historical account, as in *How We Got Our Denominations,* by S. I. Stuber, 1948. And it is a more profound work than *What Americans Believe and How They Worship,* by J. P. Williams, 1952.

Rather it belongs in a group of Lutheran books in the field of comparative symbolics which study the religious bodies in terms of their official statements of doctrine. Prominent among such works in English was *Christian Symbolics* by E. H. Klotsche, 1929. That volume, composed while Dr. Klotsche was professor at Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska, set the pace with its comprehensive, dispassionate exposition of the characteristics of religious groups. Unfortunately he included most groups under the heading, "The Modern Protestant Denominations and Sects," failing to find significant theological categories for them such as Dr. Mayer has done.

In 1934 appeared *Popular Symbolics* by Th. Engelder, W. Arndt, Th. Graebner and F. E. Mayer, which was heavily indebted to the German text of *Populaere Symbolik* by Martin Guenther (1st ed. 1872; 4th ed. 1913). It was written with "a burning love for the pure doctrine and a corresponding burning hatred of all false doctrine" with a distinctly polemical result. It had an awkward system of numbered paragraphs, the index conforming to them rather than to pages. On both these matters Dr. Mayer's book is an improvement.

Churches and Sects of Christendom, by J. L. Neve, has gone through three printings, 1944, 1948, and 1952, the last edited by this reviewer. This work has the merit of grouping Protestant bodies according to "families" with theological or historical relationships—a feature lacking in Klotsche and Engelder *et al.,* but which Dr. Mayer also now happily employs. Dr. Neve's book lacked a treatment of non-Christian religious groups, which are discussed in the volume under review.

The problem of classifying religious groups is not easy to solve. The older method of dividing all Protestants under the rubrics of "Lutheran" and "Reformed" failed to recognize that the differences, for example, between Mennonites and Presbyterian are as significant as between Lutherans and Presbyterians. Dr. Mayer has avoided the historical mistake of lumping Anabaptism with Calvinism. His treatment therefore is much more realistic and historically clear-headed than was *Popular Symbolics.*

Yet the problem remains, as the author recognizes on page 194. He takes note of the fact that there will be some dissatisfaction over grouping the Anglicans among the Reformed bodies. Even if it could be proven that Cranmer would have made the English Church a thorough replica of the Genevan, the Elizabethan settlement gave that church a somewhat different character—as the failure of Presbyterianism in the Commonwealth and Restoration demonstrated.

The general pattern of treatment in this book is: the historical background, a statement of the formal and material principles, a review of basic doctrines, and a characterization of the related bodies, followed by a bibliography. Always it is the theological features of a body which receive major attention.

In devoting but thirteen pages to the Eastern Orthodox and one hundred pages to Roman Catholicism this book indicates where evangelical Christianity has its most active battle line. The Romanist positions are thoroughly outlined in contrast to the evangelical. Notice is taken of Catholic Action and Neo-Thomism. Extensive quotations from German and English Romanist manuals constitute large footnotes, sometimes running to half a page. The finespun distinctions of the Romanist theologians are exhibited, e.g., the "metaphysical" and the "theological" certainty of salvation.

The Romanist position is constantly read in sharp contrast to Lutheran doctrine. The discussion will be understood more readily by one trained in theology, especially the terminology used in the Synodical Conference. Otherwise some items will be obscure, as for example, when implicit faith is called a "collier's faith" following Luther's statement that *"der Köhler glaubt, wie die christliche Kirche glaubt."* The weakness of Paul Blanchard's positions is indicated in footnote 95.

Part III (the word "part" is used through-

out instead of "chapter") on Lutheranism begins with "Luther's Theological Development" and ends with "Lutheranism in America." It is a comprehensive, well-phrased interpretation, typical of the way Lutherans write about themselves. Lutheran doctrine is expressed in terms of the Confessions, with footnote attention to present-day literature, especially that which proposes interpretations other than traditional, e.g., Aulen and Althaus.

The viewpoints expressed will generally be accepted among Lutherans. Dissent will arise with the implication that Lutheran doctrine is a closed system instead of a theology with a growing edge. The implication becomes explicit at one point: "In Lutheran theology all Christian doctrine is viewed as one complete unit, a golden ring which must remain unbroken, and every Christian accepts the Gospel rightly taught or no Gospel at all" (p. 173).

A few emendations might be suggested in the historical sketch of Lutherans in America. Not 1623 but 1637 is the earliest recorded presence of a Lutheran in New Netherland. The earliest evidence of organized activity there was the petition of 1649, as Kreider has shown. The Tennessee Synod, as well as the Ohio, was outside the General Synod. It was in 1946 that the ELC dropped "Norwegian" from its name, and in 1944 when the UELC dropped "Danish." AELC and Danish ELC are listed separately, whereas they are identical; and the history given of the AELC is incorrect. The Icelandic Synod is not an independent body, but since 1940 has been a constituent synod of the ULCA. And mention should be made of the convention of the Lutheran World Federation at Hannover in 1952.

The treatment of historic Calvinism is comprehensive and clear, the differences from Lutheranism being emphasized. In the account of Presbyterian bodies it should be noted that beginnings are to be traced to Scotch-Irish settlers rather than to English. In tracing the development of New England Theology the treatment follows Foster's *Genetic History,* whereas the biography of *Nathaniel William Taylor* by S. E. Mead gives a more discriminating interpretation. The section on the Baptists is excellent.

In telling the history of the Anglicans the reader might get the impression from page 276 that the University of Pennsylvania was Anglican at its founding, whereas it was nondenominational. The comprehensive spirit of the Protestant Episcopal Church is correctly noted. "Yet its very inclusiveness mystifies anyone who desires a trumpet to give a distinct sound" (p. 289).

It would be helpful to the reader if the name of the major Moravian body in America was given more distinctly, its present status indicated, and its famous Indian missions remembered. Including the Mennonites among "The Enthusiastic or Inner Light Bodies" is theologically astute. "The Mennonite emphasis upon the outward purity of the Church" (p. 393) is, however, a more striking Anabaptist motif, as observed by F. H. Littell in *The Anabaptist View of the Church,* 1952. Concerning the Quakers it was the Yearly Meeting of 1806, not 1906, that changed the "discipline" (p. 405), and the footnote in Russell should read p. 296. The section entitled "The Millennial Trend" is a concise analysis of the various kinds of millenialism with criticisms thereof, the section providing adequate orientation for the study of the groups which follow. The author is to be commended for discarding with a footnote the "ascension robes" story of the Adventists.

Part IX, Interdenominational Trends and Organizations, gives in each case the pertinent facts, a brief analysis and criticism. Here are stated the reasons why some Lutherans remain outside the National Council of Churches and similar organizations.

Appended is a Glossary of Dogmatical Terminology, and a table of statistics available in 1954 covering groups of 5,000 members or more. And there is an adequate index.

This volume represents an enormous amount of labor in the study of a large body of literature. The bibliographies reveal acquaintance with the most recent works on the various groups. The footnotes present much interesting supplemental material, though some of them might have been eliminated without serious loss. When footnotes occupy three-fourths of a page, as happened

several times, some reduction might be considered. The writing is clear, and the analyses are concise—frequently in numbered paragraphs. Students will find this a useful, facile tool. It is to be commended as the most recent, most comprehensive book in its field. The publisher has done a beautiful job of book-production.

W. D. Allbeck

Against the Stream. By Karl Barth. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 253 pages. $3.75.

This volume is a collection of Barth's shorter writings, talks, lectures, and occasional papers, written between 1946 and 1952. The influential Swiss theologian here addresses himself to a variety of post-war issues, political, economic, and cultural as well as theological, always from the point of view of God's revelation of himself in Christ. The editor, Ronald G. Smith, informs us that the author himself suggested the title for the English collection, "not because he imagines himself *contra mundum* in his whole concern, but because his concern keeps so closely to the inner stream of the Christian message that it is bound to appear to move against the stream of political thought in the West."

Only two of the writings may be said to be strictly theological in nature. One is "The Christian Understanding of Revelation," an admirably clear and pointed résumé of a subject to which Barth's contribution has been nothing less than epoch-making. His concept of revelation, with its radical Christ-centeredness and its implications for the message of the church and the life of the Christian in freedom and love, penetrates to the heart of the living Word. It contains an incisive criticism of those who approach divine self-revelation in terms of rational speculation, as well as of those who identify the Word with the text of Scripture. In the other theological essay, "The Christian Message and the New Humanism," Barth discusses the "actuality" of the Christian message as "the humanism of God," centering in the incarnate Lord who reveals the meaning both of divine and of human existence and brings to us both God's judgment and his grace.

By far the greater portion of the book is devoted to political issues. In the lengthy opening essay on "The Christian Community and the Civil Community" Barth takes his stand on the Barmen Declaration and points out the impossibility of a neutral or indifferent attitude on the part of the church toward the state. "By praying for it, it also makes itself responsible for it before God." The church cannot take the Kingdom of God itself into the political arena, and there can be no such thing as a Christian state or a Christian political party. But the church must acknowledge the work which God performs through the civil community, bear witness to his will in all areas of life, and provide the state with Christian citizens. The duty of the church to be actively concerned with the affairs of the state in every country regardless of the form of government is based on the fact that the state is not the result of sin but an important form of divine providence. On the whole, Christianity has an affinity with the democratic community of free people, but every political system has both good and bad elements and something of God's wisdom and mercy is evident even in the worst of political orders.

In other essays, notably in "The Church between East and West," Barth deals specifically with the church's attitude toward the conflict between democracy and communism. He issues a solemn warning against identifying the cause of Christ with that of western democracy. The Christian element in western culture is actually but a thin veneer covering prejudice, selfishness, lust for power. Communism, on the other hand, is at least honest in its godlessness. And while it is guilty of inhumanity and violence, it has tackled with its bloody hands more seriously than the West the problem of social injustice. Barth finds it difficult to decide whether from the Christian point of view communism merits a stronger condemnation than capitalism. His advice is to consider the tension between the United States and Russia as a mere power-conflict with which the church has no direct concern at all.

Perhaps the most valuable portion of the book consists of the documents of Barth's visit to Hungary in 1948. Here is a unique

record of the preaching of the Gospel behind the Iron Curtain by a leading western theologian. What did he say? The church has not been commissioned either to support or attack any norms, ideals, laws, or ideologies. It must proclaim the Gospel, not of communism or of anti-communism, but of Christ. Those who live by this Gospel walk in obedience to God and in the responsible freedom of the children of God, no matter what the political regime may be. To be personally responsible to God means to think things out for oneself, to have the courage to use one's God-given intelligence instead of being swayed by any emotional earthly loyalty. We have no fixed program because we have a living Master whom we must serve in the most varied circumstances and situations.

Barth is doubtless right in insisting that we cannot be of any real help to our brethren behind the Iron Curtain simply by attacking communism. It is also hard to disagree with his thesis that the best defense against communism is the establishment of a higher degree of social justice in our own midst. But it is just as difficult to escape the impression that Barth's attitude toward communism is too conciliatory. While the Christian Gospel and the American foreign policy are not to be identified, neither is the cause of truth served by playing down the irreconcilability of the Christian and the communistic ways of life. Barth advocates a course of opportunism rather than of heroic witness, a course which some Christian leaders in the Iron Curtain countries have indeed followed. Their conduct may be understood but hardly admired. In the highly interesting correspondence between Barth and Brunner included in the present volume the latter has a valid point in wishing that Barth had assumed the same firm stand toward collaboration with the communists as he did toward collaboration with the Nazis.

The style of this book is aptly described by the editor as "an earthy tang, an athletic sinewy idiom which gives pith and vigor to thinking." The issues with which it deals are at once as timeless as the Bible and as timely as tomorrow's newspaper. Here is a bridge between theology and the most serious of current world problems. Whether one always agrees with the author or not, he compels the reader to think and to think in terms of the Gospel.

T. A. Kantonen

The Transformation of the Scientific World View. By Karl Heim. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953. 258 pages. $3.50.

The purpose of this book, not suggested by the title, is to draw out the religious implications of recent scientific developments, especially in nuclear physics. These developments are of such a radical nature as to constitute a new "Copernican revolution" in modern cosmology.

As far as the transformation of the scientific world view is concerned, the book will not present anything new to the informed reader. That transformation, beginning with the turn of the century, has been effectively described and popularized by others like Whitehead, Eddington, Jeans, etc. Heim is helpful in that he reduces the technical jargon to a minimum and supports his discussion with a great variety of illustrations and analogies. This is all to the good. At the same time he keeps admitting, as do all competent scientists, that recent developments in nuclear physics make it impossible to "picture" our world as was the case in classical physics. Incidentally, it is gratifying to discover a survey such as this one, coming as it does from a highly competent scholar and motivated by a genuine appreciation for the findings of scientific research, with no thought of casting suspicion on them in the interest of a "biblical" science —as has been the vogue in fundamentalist circles.

What is new in the book is the significance of the scientific transformation for faith—particularly personal faith. Following Luther's explanation of the First Commandment (What does it mean to have a God?) Heim thinks it is possible to arrive at a conception of faith that cuts across all theological orientations. Luther's explanation becomes a workable definition that all would be disposed to accept. On the basis of this definition, he assumes that faith presupposes having an absolute object. The whole point of his discussion is to show that the development of

the sciences, particularly nuclear physics, has rendered all scientific absolutes outmoded. (Dewey's *Quest For Certainty* has much in common with Heim-with an entirely different motivation.) He concerns himself with four of them: (1) "the absolute object," by which he means the possibility of assuming that an object can be known as it is in itself, independently of the locale and point of view of the observer; (2) "absolute space;" (3) "absolute time;" and (4) "the absolute determination of the world process" by which he means determinism in the causal nexus. Any attempt to construct a bridge from the relativity of the sciences to the absolute object of faith which is God, Heim vigorously denies. Science knows no absolutes. In this connection, Heim thinks Paul never intended in Romans 1 to convey the notion that a direct knowledge of God is possible on the basis of evidences in creation. What he is concerned about, says Heim, is man's inveterate tendency to absolutize something less than God. Man's impiety consists not in a wilful and irresponsible atheism, but in substituting another god for the true God. Man is an inveterate god-worshipper (as he most certainly was also in Paul's day); only he is an idolater until he comes to know the true God. The point Heim drives home is the futility of coming to religious terms with anything in the scientific world view so as to satisfy faith's desire for an absolute ground.

More positively, Heim thinks the outmoded absolutes of classical physics, which for centuries formed the basis for natural theology, confront man with an either/or: either no absolute ground for faith, which is where science has led us and where faith confronts an "impersonal X," or the absolute ground given in the biblical revelation. In the midst of all crumbling and outmoded scientific absolutes, the First Commandment gets a new urgency: "I am the Absolute, and thou shalt have no other absolutes beside me" (p. 26).

This existentialist emphasis, he thinks, should not cause special difficulty for the scientific mind, because science itself in coming to the conclusion that the "absolute object" no longer exists, assumes the need for taking the observer into consideration, even in the most exacting calculations. Science and religion converge in attaching importance to the matter of personal involvement in the search for truth.

Does this either/or rule out the possibility of any bridge between science and faith? One might be led to think that Heim's genuine appreciation of the sciences would favor some positive approach to the problem. But no! The world of natural science and the world of faith constitute wholly disparate areas, to be bridged only by an act of choice. The development of the sciences offers only a negative support for faith: it has destroyed every vestige and shred of evidence that a man might find in nature to support his faith. So, despite the warm and sympathetic appreciation one finds in these pages, that appreciation does not permit one to feel that he is living in a "friendly universe." Any such feeling, were it to be based on the sciences, would in Heim's mind, rest on an idolatrous foundation. One wonders whether Heim would want to spell out this conclusion for the views of men like A. N. Whitehead and Samuel Alexander.

We should be grateful for this extreme Barthian point of view so ably expressed. And besides, we should be grateful for the intense personal faith that breathes through its pages. We should be glad for the recurring emphasis put upon the distinctive character of biblical faith. But at the same time, we should not be blind to the problem it poses. Heim's existentialism may be a wholesome corrective as over against all traditional natural theology as well as against any contemporary theology that is content to rest its case on a naturalistic base. But a corrective is not a norm. The problem of positively integrating the transformation of the scientific world view with an evangelical Christian faith, urgent as it is in our day, is certainly made *more,* rather than *less* difficult, for one who takes Heim's point of view seriously as one must.

STANLEY L. OLSEN

The Socratic. Number Five. Contemporary Philosophy and Christian Faith. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1952. 63 pages. $1.75.

This little volume deserves far wider recog-

nition than it is likely to get from either philosophers or theologians in America. It reprints papers given originally before the Oxford University Socratic Club and carries you into the midst of as stirring a debate of philosophical and theological issues as is going on anywhere at the present time. The participants are for the most part philosophers with a theologian and a literary critic added. The philosophers are H. H. Price, John Wisdom, Geoffrey Midgley, I. M. Crombie, Basil Mitchell, and Iris Murdoch. The literary critic, novelist, and apologist for the Christian faith is C. S. Lewis. The theologian is Austin Farrer.

All these men represent a comparatively recent departure in philosophical endeavor. They are Logical Empiricists, but not Logical Positivists. While acknowledging their indebtedness to Wittgenstein and the other Logical Positivists they do not arrive at all at the same conclusions. They agree in this, however: The task of the philosopher is not the building of systems or the answering of the questions of ultimate concern. It is the much more humble task of logical analysis. It is a question of analyzing sentences, arriving at meaning, distinguishing sense from nonsense, and identifying the various uses of language.

On this basis theological sentences are not ruled out as non-sensical as they would be by the Logical Positivists. They are accepted as performing a different function than, let us say, mathematical propositions or the sentences in a history book. The referends of the theological words, such as God, are not identifiable in the ordinary way. Yet they do point to something very specific and meaningful communication is possible. Theological sentences employ analogy and parable and paradox for that which eludes exact description.

This type of philosophical analysis commends itself as the hand-maiden of theology. At last there is some hope that the perennial problem of the proper relation between theology and philosophy will find a solution. The questions of ultimate concern are not answered by the autonomous reason of man, but man's God-given reason is a fine and precious tool with which to keep theologians in line and make them aware of the tyranny of words.

The papers are recommended and the whole approach is recommended as a hopeful sign in a battle of words now many thousands of years old. MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Kierkegaard and the Bible, An Index. By Paul S. Minear and Paul S. Morimoto. Princeton Pamphlets No. 9. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1953. 33 pages.

The authors have rendered a laudable service to the three groups of readers they had in mind, students of Kierkegaard, students of hermeneutics, and ordinary Bible readers. The index is prefaced by a very helpful essay on S.K.'s use of the Bible. Students of Kierkegaard should look to the Bible as well as to his other readings for the prime key to his thought. Students of hermeneutics will find in S.K.'s Bible interpretation an excellent example of the kind of demythologization for which Bultmann is at present pleading. There is no grasp of the biblical message except there where there is existential participation. God does not speak and does not impart himself except to the one who is transformed in his existence. Thirdly, the ordinary Bible reader will learn from Kierkegaard how to listen to the Word of God and let it address him personally. The Bible will speak in a new way to those who listen to it under Kierkegaard's tutelage.

The index itself was carefully prepared by the authors working together. It gives every evidence of being complete. It is arranged according to the books of the Bible and indicates all Bible passages referred to in those of Kierkegaard's works which have up to now appeared in English. The authors deserve a word of thanks and commendation for this painstaking task and for the most helpful hints in the introductory essay. No reader of S.K. should be without this pamphlet. MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Christianity and Existentialism. By J. M. Spier. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1953. 140 pages. $3.00.

This is a translation from the Dutch done

by David Hugh Freeman, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Wilson College. Mr. Spier is introduced as an exponent of the so-called Christian philosophy of Hermann Dooyeweerd. The following representatives of Existentialism are treated: Kierkegaard and Nietzsche (not Dosteoievsky, a notable omission) as representing the background; Jaspers, Heidegger, Marcel, Lavelle, Sartre, Loen, as exponents of contemporary existentialism. Then there follows a critique of "Existentialism in the Light of Christianity," which results in a rejection of Existentialism.

Kierkegaard himself hated what he called "paragraph vultures," dapper dons who summarized a man's thought in a paragraph, spoke a word of appreciation and then dashed on. It is difficult not to heap similar scorn on this attempt to summarize the extremely difficult views of eight different people within the scope of 75 pages. *Cui bono?*

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God. By George E. Ladd. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952. 193 pages. $3.

The author is Associate Professor of New Testament at the Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California. He is a premillennarianist and this book is a defense of this position from a fundamentalist point of view which accepts the *plenary* inspiration of the Bible, whatever that is. The author is acquainted with much of the literature on the subject, even that which is not written from the fundamentalist position. What seems to make the whole endeavor utterly incongruous, however, as far as this reviewer is concerned, is the failure to distinguish between the time of faith in which we live under the conditions of space and time and God is present to us only in his "hiddenness," and the end of time when there occurs the transition to sight and when alone there can be fulfillment of the entire creation in a new heaven and a new earth. The premillennarian return of Christ and a subsequent reign of Christ on this earth is simply a violation of the terms of our existence. Here is conclusive evidence of the need for radically demythologizing the New Testament.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

The Second Coming of Christ. By L. Berkhof. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1953. 102 pages. $1.50.

In five brief chapters this little volume seeks to summarize the great theme of "The Second Coming" under the headings: the time, manner, purpose, glory and comfort of His coming. In view of the importance of eschatological thinking, particularly relative to the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches, such an emphasis is no doubt welcome by many.

From the conservative point of view nothing new has been added. This point of view is clearly and succinctly stated, though all too briefly to meet the problems raised. The author lumps all who disagree with him under the terms, "modernists." An unproportioned space is given to the "Jehovah's Witnesses" and the dispensationalists.

The author proceeds on a literalistic interpretation of Scripture. Many will appreciate this. And yet it poses many problems particularly in the field of eschatology. A sentence as follows indicates the author's struggle here: "But *clearly* this passage *evidently means* that. . . ."

This reviewer finds it difficult to dispense as summarily with such an important and fluid problem as eschatology. The author no doubt recognizes this too and one would say Amen to this one of his final sentences: "He (God) calls upon us to commit ourselves unreservedly to him and to his loving care and gives us the assurance that all things work together for the good of those that love and fear him. It will help us if we bear in mind constantly that God's ways are higher than our ways and his thoughts than our thoughts." Let us keep it that way.

The volume is void of annotations and index.

JAMES J. RAUN

Verhängnis und Hoffnung der Neuzeit. By Friedrich Gogarten. Stuttgart: Vorwerk Verlag, 1953. 220 pages.

Professor Gogarten originally belonged to the inner circle of the "crisis theology" representing the Lutheran element in the formative years of the movement. But about 1933

the erstwhile friends, Barth, Brunner, and Gogarten, became theological antagonists. While Karl Barth developed an absolutely negative attitude toward the Hitler regime, Gogarten came at times dangerously close to a positive appraisal, although he never accepted the theological follies of the so-called German Christians.

In the volume under review Gogarten presents a keen analysis of the spiritual conditions of our time. What distinguishes our time, the "Neuzeit," from all former periods of history is the complete secularization of life, the author rightly contends. A type of man has emerged who feels himself to be autonomous through and through. Most critics are inclined to interpret this fact as a complete disintegration of western culture in general and of Christianity in particular. Contrary to this view, Gogarten tries to show that the Christian faith, from its very inception, carried within itself the germ of secularizing life. The Christian faith "demythologizes" and consequently secularizes the world, because it is faith not in the world but in God. The process of secularization therefore should be understood not as a disintegration of the Christian view of life. Instead, it ought to be regarded as its logical and legitimate consequence. Secularization has taught man to be responsible for his own life and for the good order of society. But its purpose cannot be accomplished without faith in God. Hence it is the duty of the church to see to it that the faith is proclaimed in a way which modern man can understand and appreciate.

Gogarten evidently is moved by the same desire which has prompted Bultmann to "demythologize" the message of the Bible. Yet Gogarten remains critical of Bultmann as well as of the German Lutheran bishops' critical reply to the latter. Nevertheless the author is well aware of the fact that forces are at work in our society which are materialistic and which are utterly at variance with the Christian approach to reality. In contradistinction to secularization he calls this phenomenon "secularism," i.e., a dogmatic denial of God. The two are related to each other but are not identical. And the book tries to show such a soulless materialism may be counteracted by a new and better understanding of the Christian message.

While the basic theme of the volume is undoubtedly sound and laudable, the development of the argument is, in the eyes of the reviewer, often extremely difficult to follow.

OTTO W. HEICK

Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott. Eine christliche Ethik des Politischen. By Walter Künneth. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1954. 616 pages.

This newest book by the author of "Theologie der Auferstehung" and "Der Grosse Abfall" is the most complete treatment of political ethics to be published in post-war Germany. Künneth, former director of the "Apologetische Zentrale," brings to this task the experience of over twenty years' struggle against the powers that encroached upon the Christian religion. He makes free use of hundreds of articles and books that have appeared since the fall of Hitler. His footnotes are numerous and long, often covering a whole page. They are extremely revealing, since the text deals almost exclusively with political ethics on a general level, while the footnotes supply a mass of illustrations from recent German and Russian history. The author has a prodigious memory, he has read everything—or almost everything—that has a bearing on his subject and he quotes from his sources freely. As a matter of fact, one is tempted to read the footnotes first, before reading the text, because they are so interesting.

The book is divided into five main parts with dozens of subdivisions. The first part, "Biblical and Reformatory Basis for Political Ethics," gives first the biblical *Geschichtsbild* as it affects human authority. The emphasis is here on the demonic powers which destroy the God-ordained powers, then on God's *Weltpolitik* which gives a definite eschatological character to all things political. The author then proceeds to describe in detail the attitude of the early Christians towards the higher authorities and the teaching of Luther and the other reformers concerning the state. The confusing problem of the "Two Kingdoms," their overlapping functions, and the historical misunderstandings to which this

thesis has been subjected are treated at length. However, although Künneth tries to give a clear definition of the "Two Kingdoms" by stating positively the Christian's duty towards the state, and negatively the state's limitations, he fails to give a satisfactory answer to the burning question of what should be the Christian's reaction against the *tyrannis*. The second part deals with the "Basic Elements of Political Order," ranging from the principle of order in general to the various types of authority as they appear in history to the present-day perversions of it in the Total State. Künneth states that the political order is not a "Creation Order" (*Schöpfungsordnung*), but a "Preservation Order" (*Erhaltungsordnung*). Thus all false theories derived from "natural law" are discarded and the Christian accepts the "Trinitarian principle" of all human authority. The state is theonomous, although at times it may forget its true function and become subject to demonic forces. But the adage (coined by an Englishman 50 years ago) that "Might makes Right" is a perversion of God-given power. The author proceeds then to discuss in detail the conditions which made this present perversion of the function of the State possible: metaphysical uprooting, ethical indifference, human thirst for power, and the great curse of the machine age, *Massenmenschentum*. The end result is the metamorphosis of all values in the hands of dialectic materialism (e.g., "peace" means "war against the enemies of the system"). Part Three is entitled, "The Problem of Power." It deals with governmental power (police, capital punishment, army, international law), revolution, and war and Christian ethics. War is a necessity, born of sin. There is, however, no room for a Christian justification of war. The Christian merely goes to war in obedience to God's command to be subject to the higher powers, to defend his loved ones, to preserve the state from anarchy. An interesting sidelight to this discussion is the remark by the author that conscientious objectors have no legal status in many democratic countries, e.g., in neutral, reformed Switzerland. The right to revolt against the government is upheld, within limits, but the limits are drawn so closely that for all practical purposes the right does not exist. Künneth is aware of the fact that his views are at variance with many theologians, including Lutherans, but he hews close to the line traditionally ascribed to Luther. The demoniacal power of anarchy frightens him. Part Four, "The Christian in Political Decisions," takes up such basic concepts as "honor," "oath," "obedience," and "responsibility" and proceeds then to discuss political actualities like "guilt" (He rejects the idea of "collective guilt" as thoroughly un-Christian), "political action," "party politics," etc. In these discussions the line is drawn clearly between true honor, obedience, responsibility, and the caricature of these values as seen in modern, secularized man. The oath is a necessity for the preservation of the order and a Christian has no right to refuse it, although in specific cases the limit of the validity of the oath is clearly defined in the Bible. The final part, "The Congregation of Christ in the Political World," is largely historical. It is a complete rejection of the theories of state-churchism (as found in history in the Russian Church), of the Roman theory of the state with its theocratic bias, of the Reformed idea of Christian world-reform (including the Neo-Calvinism of Karl Barth), and the enthusiastic solution (that the state is evil). Rather the function of the Christian congregation is to preach Law and Gospel in the state, to carry out the office of shepherd and watchman, and to rouse the people's conscience. There are few things in the field of political ethics which are not covered in this book. It is thoroughly "Lutheran."

WALTER G. TILLMANNS

How to Build the Rural Church Program. By Calvin Schnucker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 158 pages. $2.50.

In an early chapter of his book the author writes: "The minister who accepts the responsibility of ministering to a local church cannot assume that his service should be delegated to that church alone. He must immediately take cognizance of the community as a part of which his church is functioning. To separate person from community is to

give impetus to the fragmentation of society which at the present time is only too evident in rural America. One of the really tragic factors that has done much to dissipate the influence of the rural church has been the indifferent stubbornness of church leaders in ignoring the community and its relationship to people."

In these words Professor Schnucker sounds a theme which runs throughout his book, resulting in acute observations as to the development and present status of communities and churches in rural America and practical suggestions as to what the church should do and can do in the face of the present challenge. On the other hand, he never loses sight—as some rural church writers have done—of the primary challenge, "let the Church be the Church." He has sufficient material in the sociological aspects to make his book relevant, but his chapters are not burdened with excessive statistics and other data.

The work is divided into three parts. First, Searching for Facts, embodying a brief but penetrating historical survey followed by practical guidance in the important steps of studying the community, the family and the local parish. The second section, entitled Building the Program, offers suggestions for analyzing and interpreting the results of the studies, goals to be established, and a chapter on developing the program and checking the results. The third part of the book deals with the evangelism outreach of the church, with chapters on The Unreached, two on the "Larger Parish" plan, The Difficult Parish, Financing, Rural Church Building and, in conclusion, The Forward Look.

The book is written for rural pastors and lay leaders and students who plan to serve in the rural field. It should be a most valuable aid for them; also denominational leaders and administrators should find it valuable, particularly the third part of the book. It is realistic in viewing the problems, but a spirit of love for rural life and confident faith in the future of the rural church prevails in every chapter. The writer says, "All my memories, both from boyhood days and from recent years, are centered in the rural church." A minister of the Presbyterian Church, Pastor Schnucker has since 1942 been head of the Department of Rural Church and Life at the Theological Seminary of the University of Dubuque, and head of the Division of Pastoral Theology since 1952. From this first-hand experience he enlivens his chapters with many examples and "case histories" illustrating problems, failures and successes; and he offers practical, tested suggestions for each phase of the program he discusses. As he admits, not all of these will meet the needs of every situation nor fit the polity and practices of every denomination. Nevertheless, the book should be interesting and stimulating to anyone interested in the church in rural America. The simple, free-flowing style of the writing will make the reading a pleasurable experience for laymen as well as pastors and teachers.

There is no index, which in this case does not seem to be a serious omission. A brief practical bibliography is included. About half of the listings are bulletins and pamphlets which may be obtained at little or no cost; these alone will provide a rich source of information and guidance to rural lay leaders and pastors.

C. C. Madsen

Growing in Christ. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953. 296 pages. $1.50. With *Workbook,* by Edwin Jiede, 50 cents.

This recent addition to Concordia's rather extensive body of materials for catechetical work is called a "new illustrated catechism for grades 4, 5, and 6." Elsewhere it is termed "an intermediate catechism."

The text is a bound volume with numerous drawings and considerable color. The workbook is similarly in the current style of school materials. It has the usual devices of matching and completing statements, checking lists, writing biblical references, and the like. It includes numerous drawings and closes with a crossword puzzle.

Growing In Christ has four parts. Part I is Luther's Catechism printed vividly on the first thirty pages. Parts III and IV are a short life of Luther and supplementary aids, such as pupil prayers. The main portion of the book is in the 240 pages of Part II. There are 33 units which correspond to "the divisions in

the synodical catechism." The first unit is on *The Existence of God,* but the pupil arrives quickly at the five parts of the catechism.

The publication house says: "The doctrines of Luther's Small Catechism are presented in a threefold plan of repetition: 1) in the form of Bible stories, a series of pertinent Bible texts, and a formulation of the doctrine in paragraph form; 2) a series of questions and answers, together with a word study, hymn stanza, prayer, and *What This Means to Me* (The last feature is to integrate the Bible doctrine with the life of the learner. The questions and answers are short and written in easy-to-understand language); 3) for a third time the same subject matter appears in the form of study exercises in the workbook.

Growing In Christ is presented as "the very first non-abstract, functional presentation of Luther's doctrinal explanations specifically for the intermediate level." By way of evaluation, certain questions seem pertinent. Can a teacher adapt this material, work it down into the capacity of the prospective pupils to read and understand and think? Even if so, to what extent can 4th, 5th and 6th grade pupils experience the faith-life here detailed? If this is the first non-abstract and functional presentation, who will lead us beyond what is scarcely more than a beginning?

RALPH D. HEIM

Twenty Occasional Sermons. By Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1953. 234 pages. $3.

Twenty sermons occasioned by special days and events in the life of a parish are contained in this volume of unexceptional sermons. Although covering a wide variety of occasions from Children's Day to Ordination and Farewell to Congregation there are some surprising omissions. Rally Day, Youth Sunday, Baccalaureate, and Graduation are included but Confirmation is not. Memorial Day and Independence Day are listed but not Labor Day. Universal Bible Sunday and Temperance Sunday are included but not World Wide Communion Sunday. It is also to be regretted that Mother's Day is listed but not the Christian Family.

Like most such collections of sermons by different authors, the offerings vary in quality. The sermons are biblical and evangelical in content but there is a curious reluctance for the most part to develop the text which is provided in each instance. Perhaps this may illustrate one of the hazards of the "occasional" sermon. The desire to use a text is evident but the difficulty in finding a text which is something more than a springboard for jumping into a topical treatment of the occasion is also evident. On the whole there is little to be found here, unfortunately, in the way of originality, insight, or stimulation. One suspects that whatever instruction and inspiration were conveyed through these sermons came from the devotion of the pastor to his people rather than from any unusual persuasiveness in the form and content of the message itself.

EDMUND A. STEIMLE

Victory By The Cross. By Theodore Huggenvik. Augsburg Publishing House, 1954. 118 pages. $1.50.

This is a volume of Lenten meditations. It consists of three parts, designed by the author to present a sequence of themes. Part I is "The Cross On The Hill And The Empty Grave Proclaim The Victory." Seven meditations on the Words from the Cross, plus meditations for Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter compose this section. Part II is "The Penitent Sinner Answers I Believe And Shares the Victory." Here are six meditations on the Second Article of The Creed. Part III is but one meditation on Pilate to which the author gives the title, "Indifference And Unbelief Keep Many From Sharing In The Victory."

These meditations are definitely devotional in character. They breathe the spirit of reverence and deep Christian faith. They are faithfully evangelical, filled with scripture references, and true to Lutheran tradition. The meditations on the Seven Words were prepared for use at a Good Friday Service at which the author was the only speaker. They give evidence of this actual use and have the merit of a certain continuity of thought.

One has the feeling that at times the speaker has used the text as a starting point and moved on from it to the doctrinal truth he proposes to declare or defend. There is something of the proof-text impression left. One could also wish that the titles were more compact in their statement. But the work as a whole is valuable as testimony, suggestive for preaching, and helpful for devotions.

Approving comment on the format, and the general arrangement and appearance is decidedly in order.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

A Sober Faith—Religion and Alcoholics Anonymous. By G. Aiken Taylor. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953. 108 pages. $2.

This book is concerned with the relationship between Alcoholics Anonymous and historical Christianity. It is apparent that the author has had a rich and sympathetic ministry with alcoholics and that he is committed to a positive and evangelical understanding of historical Christianity.

In the first three chapters, the author discusses these topics: 1. Who is an alcoholic? 2. Just what is this fellowship known today by the simple designation A.A.? 3. How does their program work in the lives of men and women? Few non-alcoholics have such a grasp of this twelve-step program of recovery. In the fourth chapter, the author discusses the first two steps of the program in relation to the Christian view of human nature. He does not entertain any superficial and optimistic delusions about man. In Chapter Five, he takes up steps three through seven, over against the Christian teaching of redemption. His emphasis is upon the believer's appropriation of forgiveness and the effect which this miracle has upon a person's life in the here and now. In Chapter Six, the author relates the last five steps of the program to the Christian doctrine of sanctification. The last chapter is entitled "An Unresolved Conflict." Here he points out the lessons which organized religion can learn from the A.A. movement and the weaknesses of the program. "God, apparently, doesn't make too hard terms with those who seek him—at first. But He will not forever be satisfied to maintain intimate relations with someone who insists upon calling Him Electricity."

The discernment of the author throughout the book is frank and brilliant. In places, he uses expressions which one hears at A.A. meetings. Whoever has had contact with the movement will not be alarmed by them. The busy pastor will glean from these pages a number of excellent sermon illustrations taken from real life.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor

A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor

WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager

PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augusta Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwest Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Blair, Neb.

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

VOLUME VI

1954

Times and News Publishing Co.

Index to Volume VI

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

ALLBECK, W. D.
Review of: Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America* ... 364
BACHMANN, E. THEODORE
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *Germany* ... 170, 352
BAGGER, HENRY H.
Review of: Ellis, *Christian Stewardship* ... 184
BARTSCH, HANS-WERNER
The Meaning of the Ascension ... 44
BAUGHMAN, HARRY F.
Reviews of: Miller, *Fire in Thy Mouth* ... 359
Huggenvik, *Victory By the Cross* ... 375
BEDENBAUGH, J. BENJAMIN
Paul's Use of "Wrath of God" ... 154
BELGUM, DAVID
Background of the Hospital Chaplaincy ... 47
BERGENDOFF, CONRAD
Body and Spirit in Christian Thought ... 187
BLANC, RENÉ
Lutheranism in France ... 102
BOYD, ROBERT H.
Reviews of: Millikin, *Jeremiah* ... 362
Long, *Queen Esther* ... 362
CARLFELT, C. G.
Review of: Runestam, *Svensk kyrka och teologi i dag* ... 273
CLIPPINGER, ROBERT S.
Review of: Stevenson, *Patterns of Protestant Church Music* ... 88
COOPER, CHARLES M.
Review of: *The Interpreter's Bible II* ... 76
COOPER, WILLIAM H.
Review of: Scott, *The Crisis in the Life of Jesus* ... 360
DITMANSON, HAROLD L.
Review of: King, *Introduction to Religion* ... 263
FISHER, WALLACE E.
Does Prayer Make Any Difference ... 42
FLACK, E. E.
Review of: Moe, *The Apostle Paul* ... 358
FORELL, GEORGE W.
Review of: Ruff, *The Dilemma of Church and State* ... 266
GREEN, LOWELL C.
Resistance to Authority and Luther ... 338
HALL, WILLIAM E.
The Formation of the Tennessee Synod ... 57
HALVORSON, JOHN V.
Reviews of: Taylor, *A Sober Faith* ... 376
HEICK, OTTO W.
Let Man Be Man ... 143
Reviews of: Klamroth, *Lutherischer Glaube* ... 184
Gogarten, *Verhängnis und Hoffnung* ... 371
HEIKKINEN, JACOB W.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *Finland* ... 257
HEIM, RALPH D.
Review of: *Growing in Christ* ... 374

HEINECKEN, MARTIN J.
Bultmann's Theology and the Message of the Preacher ... 283
Reviews of: *The Socratic* ... 369
Minear, *Kierkegaard and the Bible* ... 370
Spier, *Christianity and Existentialism* ... 370
Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* ... 371
HERTZ, KARL H.
Review of: Demant, *Religion and the Decline of Capitalism* ... 79
HILL, CHARLES L.
Melanchthon's Propositions on the Mass ... 53
Some Theses of Philip Melanchthon ... 245
HOLMER, PAUL L.
Karl Heim and Sacrifice of Intellect ... 207
Reviews of: Widgery, *What Is Religion* ... 81
O'Flaherty, *Unity and Language* ... 83
Thulstrop, *Breve ok Akstykker Vedrørende Kierkegaard* ... 277
HOOVER, HARVEY D.
Reviews of: Tillich, *Love, Power and Justice* ... 265
The Student's New Testament ... 280
Eby, *The God in You* ... 280
Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* ... 363
IVERSEN, IVER
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *Norway* ... 165
JAGNOW, ALBERT A.
Review of: Flew, ed., *The Nature of the Church* ... 77
JENSEN, T. T.
Review of: Ferm, ed., *The Protestant Credo* ... 274
KANTONEN, T. A.
Review of: Barth, *Against the Stream* ... 367
KEGLEY, CHARLES W.
Reviews of: Ducasse, *A Philosophical Scrutiny of Religion* ... 80
Schilpp, ed., *Radhakrishnan* ... 269
KILDEGAARD, AXEL C.
Preaching to a Secularized Society ... 3
KNUDSEN, JOHANNES
Grundtvig and Mythology ... 299
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *Denmark* ... 164
LEFFLER, ANDOR M.
Louis Kossuth and the American Churches ... 310
LEO, PAUL
Review of: Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma und Mythos* ... 180
LEUPOLD, ULRICH S.
Review of: Vajta, *Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* ... 275
LIEFELD, THEODORE S.
The Christian Hope in the New Testament ... 30
LINDBERG, PAUL M.
Reviews of: Beaver, *The Word of God* ... 86
Hansen, tr., *I Was Sick* ... 86
LOFT, STINUS S.
The Danish Inner Mission ... 113
MADSEN, C. C.
Reviews of: Milton, *Preaching from Isaiah* ... 279
Schnucker, *How to Build the Rural Church Program* ... 373
MATTSON, A. D.
Review of: Spann, ed., *The Church and Social Responsibility* ... 87
MORRIS, RAYMOND M.
Review of: *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* ... 178
NARUM, WM. H. K.
Reviews of: Butterfield, *Christianity, Diplomacy and War* ... 267
Samuel, *A Foundation of Ontology* ... 269
NELSON, E. CLIFFORD
Review of: Hubatsch, ed., *Europäische Briefe* ... 276
NIELSEN, NIELS C.
The Warfare Between Philosophy and Theology ... 220
OLSEN, STANLEY L.
Reviews of: Anderson, ed., *The World's Religions* ... 264
Heim, *The Transformation of the Scientific World View* ... 368

OLSON, O. N.
Review of: Kjöllerström, *Biskopstillsättningen i Sverige* 183
DE PAPP, JOHN L. E.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *Hungary* 351
RAUN, JAMES J.
Reviews of: Welch, *In His Name* 178
Berkhof, *The Second Coming of Christ* 371
REED, LUTHER D.
Review of: Müller and Blankenburg, eds., *Leiturgia I* 182
REUMANN, JOHN
Review of: Minear, *Christian Hope and the Second Coming* 356
ROTH, ROBERT PAUL
Our Christian Task in India 91
SAARNIVAARA, UURAS
The Date of the Crucifixion in the Synoptics and John 157
The Genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke 348
SCHOTT, G. F.
Reviews of: Poteat, *Mandate to Humanity* 78
Berkouwer, *Modern Uncertainty and Christian Faith* 272
Wenger, *Introduction to Theology* 272
SITTLER, JOSEPH
A Christology of Function 122
SNYDER, RUSSELL D.
Review of: Phillips, *The Gospels* 360
STEIMLE, EDMUND A.
Preaching as the Word Made Relevant 11
Review of: *Twenty Occasional Sermons* 375
STOUDT, JOHN JOSEPH
The Logos Doctrine in the East-West Controversy 227
TAPPERT, THEODORE G.
Life and Thought in World Lutheranism: *U.S.A.* 176
Germany 260
TAPPERT, WILFRIED
A Definition of Christian Stewardship 66
TILLMANNS, WALTER G.
Nor Any Thanks Have For It 63
Reviews of: Jørgensen, *Martin Luther* 274
Künneth, *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott* 372
TRAVER, AMOS JOHN
Reviews of: Schmieding, *Sex in Childhood and Youth* 86
Niles, *Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection* 363
VOIGT, GILBERT P.
The Preacher and His Reading 23
WALLICK, LLOYD M.
History As You Like It 132
Review of: Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* 77
WEAVER, GLENN
The Lutheran Church During the French and Indian War 248
WEBBER, G. R.
Wisdom Doctrines in Old Testament Literature 69
WENTZ, ABDEL ROSS
Review of: Goodspeed, *As I Remember* 84
WESTBERG, GRANGER
Our So-called Houses of Prayer 160

II. BOOKS REVIEWED

Anderson, ed., *The World's Religions* 264
Barth, *Against the Stream* 367
Bartsch, *Die Anrede Gottes* 87
———, ed., *Kerygma und Mythos* 180
Beaver, *The Word of Life* 86
Berkhof, *The Second Coming of Christ* 371
Berkouwer, *Modern Uncertainty and Christian Faith* 272

(Saint) Bonaventura, *The Mind's Road to God* 85
Butterfield, *Christianity, Diplomacy and War* 267
Demant, *Religion and the Decline of Capitalism* 79
Ducasse, *A Philosophical Scrutiny of Religion* 80
Eby, *The God in You* 280
Eifert, ed., *Crossing the Kidron* 88
Ellis, *Christian Stewardship and Church Finance* 184
Ferm, ed., *The Protestant Credo* 274
Flew, ed., *The Nature of the Church* 77
Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers I* 77
Gaynor, ed., *Dictionary of Mysticism* 85
Goad, *The Parson's Joke Book* 88
Gogarten, *Verhängnis und Hoffnung der Neuzeit* 371
Goodspeed, *As I Remember* 84
Growing in Christ 374
Hansen, tr., *I Was Sick* 86
Heim, *The Transformation of the Scientific World View* 368
Hubatsch, ed., *Europäische Briefe im Reformationszeitalter* 276
Huggenvik, *Victory By the Cross* 375
Index to Religious Periodical Literature 178
(*The*) *Interpreter's Bible II* 76
Jørgensen, *Martin Luther* 274
King, *Introduction to Religion* 263
Kjöllerström, *Biskopstillsättningen i Sverige* 183
Klamroth, *Lutherischer Glaube im Denken der Gegenwart* 184
Krokisius, *Kindergebete* 88
Künneth, *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott* 372
Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* 371
Long, *Queen Esther, Star in Judea's Crown* 362
Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America* 364
Miller, *Fire in Thy Mouth* 359
Millikin, *Jeremiah, Prophet of Disaster* 362
Milton, *Preaching from Isaiah* 279
Minear, *Christian Hope and the Second Coming* 356
Minear and Morimoto, *Kierkegaard and the Bible* 370
Moe, *The Apostle Paul* 358
Mortensen, *Stories from Our Church* 85
Müller and Blankenburg, eds., *Leiturgia I* 182
Niles, *Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection* 363
O'Flaherty, *Unity and Language* 83
Phillips, *The Gospels* 360
Poteat, *Mandate to Humanity* 78
Ruff, *The Dilemma of Church and State* 266
Runestam, *Svensk kyrka och teologi i dag* 273
Samuel, *A Foundation of Ontology* 269
Schilpp, ed., *The Philosophy of Radhakrishnan* 269
Schmieding, *Sex in Childhood and Youth* 86
Schnucker, *How to Build the Rural Church Program* 373
Scott, *The Crisis in the Life of Jesus* 360
(*The*) *Socratic* L 369
Spann, ed., *The Church and Social Responsibility* 87
Spier, *Christianity and Existentialism* 370
Stevenson, *Patterns of Protestant Church Music* 88
(*The*) *Student's New Testament* 280
Taylor, *A Sober Faith* 376
Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* 363
Thulstrop, *Breve ok Akstykker Vedrørende Søren Kierkegaard* 277
Tillich, *Love, Power and Justice* 265
Twenty Occasional Sermons 375
Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* 275
Welch, *In His Name* 178
Wenger, *Introduction to Theology* 272
Widgery, *What is Religion* 81

III. LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Denmark: *Discussion of Eternal Life and Immortality* 164
Germany: *Church and State* 170
Bultmann's Demythologization 172
Inter-Church Relations 173
Faith and Life 175
Luther Society Reorganized 259
A Roman Catholic Historian on the Indulgence Controversy 260
Church Congress in Germany 352
Hungary: *Apocalyptic in Hungary* 351
Norway: *Debate about Hell* 165
United States of America: *Microfilms of American Lutheranism* 176

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY